

HINDU CRITIQUE OF CHRISTIANITY

Chattampi Swamikal

English Translation of
'Kristumata Chedanam'

KRISTUMATA CHEDANAM

(Hindu Critique of Christianity)

By

H. H. Chattambi Swamikal

(Shanmukhadasan)

Table of Contents

Preface	4
Foreword by Chattambi Swamikal	10
PATI – PRAKARANAM	13
Purpose of Creation	14
Material Cause	22
Initial Creation	24
Evil Qualities	31
Image of God	34
Life of Christ.....	36
Reward & Punishment	72
Story of Holy Spirit	77
Trinity	79
PASHU PRAKARANAM	95
Creation	96
Creatures	103
PASA PRAKARANAM	116

Original Sin	117
GATI PRAKARANAM	120
Means to Liberation	121
Hell	127
Salvation	132
Massacres	135
KRISTUMATA SARAM	149
APPENDICES	163
Life and work of Sri Chattampi Swamikal	164
Works of Sri Chattampi Swamikal	167

Preface

"Kristumata Chedanam" is an exceptional and enlightening book in the sense that, this may, perhaps, be the only book that analyses Christianity from a Hindu perspective. This is also the first critique of Christianity in Malayalam language. This book was written by Chattampi Swamikal, the spiritual luminary from Kerala, at a time when proselytization was at its peak in India, and the poor and ignorant people of India were being lured by the masquerading missionaries. It was written in an age when no Hindu dared to criticise Christianity publicly or even defend Hinduism.

During the life and times of Chattampi Swamikal, a strong belief in the ideal of *equality of religions* (Sarva dharma Samabhâva¹ as it came to be known later in India) was prevalent among Hindus. A Hindu would not even question or criticise another religion if the persons of those religions criticised and disparaged Hindu Gods and scriptures. Chattampi Swamikal was amongst the first Hindu

¹ Sarva Dharma Sama Bhava is not a mantra from the Vedas or Puranas. In fact it was a political slogan coined by Mahatma Gandhi.

saints to cross over this intellectual barrier and to examine critically a religion of foreign origin.

He explains in this book why he attempted to criticize Christianity: *"Persons belonging to every religion would hold their scriptures as God's own words. If anyone, after a critical study of scriptures of a religion, points out any flaw and declares them as false and worth rejecting, he is countered with an argument by the faithful of that religion that scriptures are God's work and are beyond the logic of souls whose knowledge is limited and that God can act as per His wish. If so, all religions have to be considered as true and equal. The Christians' claim that their religion is the only true religion does not therefore hold water"*. Critical examination of every religion is mandatory to understand its relative merits and demerits.

He further states in his preface to the Malayalam edition: *"Having seen and heard that many Christian priests and their mercenary agents are baselessly criticising our Hindu religion, Gods, great scriptures like Vedas, Smritis, etc and are printing and publishing censoring books like "Ajnana-Kutharam" (The axe to ignorance), "Trimooriti-Lakshanam" (The characteristics of Trinity), "Kuruttuvazhi" (Path of the blind), "Satgurulabham" (Gaining the true master), "Satyajnanodayam" (Arising of true knowldge),*

"Samayapareeksha" (The test of time), "Shastram" (The science), "Pulleli kunchu". They are also enticing the people from castes like channar, pulayar, parayar, etc by luring them with caps, clothes, etc and are thus trying to convert them to Christianity and leading them to Hell. Even after witnessing and hearing many such wicked actions, it won't at all be proper if we remain silent and do not make any effort to curb these activities".

That the evangelical zeal of Christian preachers in Kerala had crossed all limits and turned, in fact, into an aggression is evident from the words of Swami Vidyananda Teertha Padar²: *"With the advent of the British rule, the Christian missionary activities gained strength in Kerala. They were audacious enough to stop the Hindu devotees while they were proceeding to temples, ask them 'not to go to the temples to worship the Satan³ and invite them to embrace Christianity and have faith in their (Christian's) true God'. No Hindu dared to resist or oppose such missionaries. It was in this situation that Chattampi Swamikal wrote and published the book 'Kristumata Chedanam' under the pen name - Shanmukhadasan".*

² In his book, "Srimat Tirthapada Paramahamsa", volume 1, chapter titled 'Efforts for conversion by Christian priests'

³ Hindu gods were called Satan by the Christian missionaries.

Swami Vidyananda Teertha Padar further states that "*Chattampi Swamikal trained some of his scholarly disciples to give discourses based on this book. Whenever a Christian preacher would start addressing a Hindu crowd gathered in the temple grounds, as was wont in those days, a disciple of the Swamikal would also, in the vicinity, start a discourse refuting Christianity. Later on (after 1890), two prominent disciples of Chattampi Swamikal travelled all over Kerala and spread the ideas given in 'Kristumata Chedanam'. This deterred the Christian zealots to a certain extent*".

Chattampi Swamikal clearly realised that the best course to deal with the Christian evangelical aggression would be to disprove their claim that Christianity is the only true religion.

In this book, Chattampi Swamikal takes up the basic tenets of Christianity one by one and tears them down with his indisputable arguments. Besides, he proves, with references drawn from their own books, that Jehovah and Jesus were not divine and that the Bible was fabricated by some wily Christians. It is evident from the concluding part of the book that he wanted Hindus also to read this book carefully and understand where Christianity stands vis-a-vis Hinduism.

The most important lesson one can learn from this book is that the popular saying, "all religions are equal" is a myth. It is only Hindus who subscribe to this myth of equality of religions. This idea can never be acceptable to a Jew, Christian or a Muslim. Hindus have to realise that Christianity and Islam are imperial ideologies in the garb of religion. As Swami Vivekananda, the greatest Hindu missionary of last century, pointed out, *"every man going out of the Hindu pale is not only a man less, but an enemy the more"*⁴.

The situation today is still as bad, if not worse. Missionaries continue to denigrate the Hindu religion without any truth or logic. If Hinduism is to survive in these turbulent times, the educated Hindus ought to work to stop conversion by creating religious awareness among the uneducated masses. The less-privileged would continue to get exploited by others as long as they remain poor and ignorant. This book would help the reader to fortify and empower himself, and also educate others, and this is the bare minimum

⁴ Swami Vivekananda, Complete Works volume 5, page 233, 1990 Edition, Published by Advaita Ashram, Chapter titled "ON THE BOUNDS OF HINDUISM".

which every one of us must do to save the Eternal Dharma and its adherents.

- Translator

Foreword by Chattambi Swamikal

Oh! Honourable citizens, this endeavour of mine is meant to enable the common man to comprehend the principles of Christianity. Having seen and heard that many Christian priests and their mercenary agents are baselessly criticising our Hindu religion, Gods, great scriptures like Vedas, Smritis, etc and are printing and publishing censoring books like "Ajnana-Kutharam" (The axe to ignorance), "Trimoorti-Lakshanam" (The characteristics of Trinity), "Kuruttuvazhi" (Path of the blind), "Satgurulabham" (Gaining the true master), "Satyajnanodayam" (Arising of true knowldge), "Samayapareeksha" (The test of time), "Shastram" (The science), "Pulleli kunchu". They are also enticing the people from castes like channar, pulayar, parayar, etc by luring them with caps, clothes, etc and are thus trying to convert them to Christianity and leading them to Hell. Even after witnessing and hearing many such wicked actions, it won't at all be proper if we remain silent and do not make any effort to curb these activities. Due to this inaction on our part, our community has so far lost its one fifth to the Christians and further loss is imminent. Many

generations of ours may, due to this inaction, be deprived of prosperity in this world and the next. Needless to say, it will befit Hindu scholars, if, instead of confining to their own affairs, they come out to join hands in the highly meritorious act of educating would-be-converts. This will not only put an end to this public nuisance but also lead these people towards peace and prosperity in this world and the next. It is my firm belief that there is no action more meritorious than this. Don't you think that all the penance, charity, chanting, sacrificial rites, scriptural study, etc are mostly in self interest? Whereas if you take such efforts as above it will not only bestow glory to you and your progeny but also rescue these ignorant people from the deep pit of Christian faith. I would like to ask the Malayali⁵ Hindus. Will you not incur God's ire if you look only to your interest and leave others to their fate, with least consideration for their suffering? I believe that all educated Hindus will stir themselves from their inaction and at least henceforth use, to their best capacity, their knowledge and wealth to nullify the harmful activities of the Christian missionaries. Inspired by the wise sayings "even the squirrel contributes its mite" and "Goddess of wealth (Lakshmi) blesses

⁵ People who speak Malayalam, the language of Kerala

only those who put in a sincere effort”, I have made it my mission to work for the above cause in spite of my meagre financial resources. As a first step in this direction, I am writing and publishing “Kristumata Chedanam”⁶. I dedicate this book to you, and I will feel blessed if you kindly rectify any flaws you notice in my arguments found in this book.

- **Shanmukhadasan**

⁶ Chattampi Swamikal wrote this book in 1890 CE, at the age of 37.

Part 1

Pati – Prakaranam

The Lord

Purpose of Creation

Shivamayam

Oh! Christian preachers,

Jehovah created this world comprising of sentient and insentient beings. Logic is that every effect has a cause. So, this world, being an effect, must have a cause and therefore a purpose behind it because no one will do an action without a motive. “प्रयोजनमनुद्दिश्य न मन्दोऽपि प्रवर्तते” – even a fool does not act without a purpose. As regards whether the motive behind the Creation is selfish or unselfish, it is beyond any doubt that this Creation is only for the benefit of Jehovah as it is said in Bible that “for I have created him for my glory” (Isaiah 43:7). Moreover, as per basic principles of Christianity there were no souls before the beginning of Creation and it cannot, therefore, be said that Creation was for the benefit of anyone else except Jehovah. The only alternative is that Jehovah created this world for His own benefit.

Jehovah, in the beginning, created two humans who were ignorant and were not endowed with pure knowledge, planted in their vicinity a tree which apparently was of no use, forbade them,

with no justification, from eating the fruits of this tree and instead of prohibiting or destroying Satan, Jehovah let him roam freely on Earth to tempt men. Misguided by Satan, the primeval men became deluded and being tempted for pleasure they violated the divine command and thus became sinners.

Thereafter, without resorting to any other means of creating souls, God allowed all souls be born as progenies of primeval men who were sinners and so all the souls became sinners. Because they were sinners, they needed to be redeemed. Since Creation gave rise to sinners, it became the indirect cause for redemption. Ways of Salvation were also revealed as a form of testing the sinners. The souls were given life on Earth, which is subject to annihilation, so as to know as pure those souls who accept the means of Salvation and have the virtue of obeying God and know the rest of the souls as impure and also about the reward and punishment they will be awarded in the next world. Creation as well as annihilation, thus, necessitates divine Grace. In order to instil fear in the pure souls in Heaven so that they do not stray from their devotion to Jehovah, punishments are inflicted upon impure souls to suffer endlessly. Thus, souls seek redemption out of fear of punishment in Hell. Those thus redeemed will

praise God and He will shine in all His glory. Ultimate object is Jehovah's gratification. It can be concluded from the above that the purpose behind the Creation was selfishness of Jehovah.

Because Jehovah created the world so that the souls will know His glory, praise Him and bow down to Him with fear and He will shine in all His glory, it can be concluded that before the creation of the world Jehovah did not shine in all His glory. He saw this surely as a limitation in Him and desiring to remove this inadequacy, He proceeded to create the world.

If His glory was complete before the creation, then it was needless to do a deed to increase His glory. This deed, if it was meant to reveal His glory to the souls, was not devoid of selfishness.

Neither could He have created world to reveal His glory for the sake of the souls, because that will contradict the fact that there were no souls before the creation of the world.

Had Jehovah desired to augment His glory by shining through the souls He was going to create, the acts of shining and creation will become mutually cause and effect and this will lead to a

logical fallacy known as “mutual dependency – anyonyashrayam”⁷.

Because He Himself was there to experience His glory, it would be improper to say that Jehovah’s glory was shining completely prior to creation but remained unappreciated and He created souls so that they will experience and praise His glory. Whatever way we may view at it, we can conclude that Jehovah did feel an inadequacy as His glory was not shining. Because He had a sense of inadequacy, He cannot be whole (poorna); because He worried about the inadequacy and tried to remove it, He cannot be eternally Joyful; because He started creation for His own joy, He has attachment or aversion towards that which pleases or displeases Him and thus He is suffering from delusion which is the root cause of attachment and aversion; because He did not know the means to remove his inadequacy in the beginning, he did not have beginning-less knowledge; because He did not create the souls in the beginning, he does not have beginning-less doership; because He acquired doership later, his doership is an ‘effect’ and there must be another person as its ‘cause’; because He gained ‘doership’

⁷ This is the fallacy of mutual dependence i.e., “A is dependent on B and B is dependent on A”. This leads to fallacious reasoning.

from someone else He does not possess sovereignty; because He lost His nature by gaining 'doership' from someone, He is not changeless; because He is neither changeless nor adequate, He is neither without a beginning nor is He eternal or pervading; because He created souls for His own joy and caused them to commit sin and suffer in eternal Hell, He is bereft of justice, compassion and goodness; because He did not know which souls were pure and had to find this out by testing them by giving them commandments after they were made to take birth on Earth as sinners, He is without omniscience; because He could neither be joyful nor the make souls praise Him without making them sinners and causing them sorrow, it is evident that He is without omnipotence. Since He has defects such as inadequacy, sorrow, desire, hatred, delusion, dependence, changeability, non-pervading, injustice, hard-heartedness, vice, limited knowledge and limited power, Jehovah does not possess Godliness. He is proved to be a sinner. Since our⁸ scriptures declare that these defects are the results of the bondage of "ego, karma and Maya⁹", Jehovah is indeed subject of bondage and therefore not independent. When we

⁸ Hindu scriptures

⁹ Maya is the impurity that binds the souls to the sense objects through desires and ignorance.

analyze the above characteristics of Jehovah from the standpoint of Saiva Siddhanta¹⁰, it could be concluded that Jehovah is a mere being (pashu) who, as per karmas accumulated from His past lives, is born with a physical body; is subject to limitations in knowledge, power and capacity to experience joy and sorrow and dies at the end of his life term like any other human being.

It is the opinion of some Christian scholars that Jehovah from time immemorial had made a resolve, without any reason, to create the world at a certain point of time, at a certain location and in a certain manner and that accordingly He created the world, without any reason, at a certain point of time. But this is not acceptable because it is not contained in Bible and is contradictory to scriptural statements such as “I made man for my glory”.

If it is true Jehovah had the resolve from time immemorial, without any reason, to create the world at a certain point of time, at a certain location and in a certain manner, He should have had a similar resolve regarding sustenance and annihilation of the world. This implies that Jehovah will grant Heaven or Hell to souls as per

¹⁰ Saiva Siddhanta is an ancient Indian philosophy according to which Siva is the ultimate and supreme reality, omniscient, omnipresent and unbound. Siva is the ‘Pati’(lord) and the souls are ‘pashus’(animals) – *Translator*.

the above resolve and not based on their sins or merits. Souls need not strive to become worthy of Salvation and the Bible, which bids the souls to have faith and make efforts towards this end, bears therefore no relevance. Therefore, Jehovah who revealed Bible to the world is unwise.

Some might say that it is not befitting the souls to question the purpose behind God's creation and that God's actions are beyond human logic. This would give rise to logical fallacy known as "anishtaprasangam"¹¹. Persons belonging to every religion would hold their scriptures as God's own words. If anyone, after a critical study of scriptures of a religion, points out any flaw and declares them as false and worth rejecting, he is countered with an argument by the faithful of that religion that scriptures are God's work and are beyond the logic of souls whose knowledge is limited and that God can act as per His wish. If so, all religions have to be considered as true and equal. The Christians' claim that their religion is the only true religion does not therefore hold water.

If one says that purpose of creation is beyond comprehension of souls it cannot be accepted as

¹¹ This is a logical fallacy wherein one's arguments lead one to undesired conclusion.

Bible clearly states Jehovah made this world for His glory. For that matter, no scripture deals with subjects which are incomprehensible. In spite of Jehovah's admitting creation of world for His own glory, if one says that purpose of creation is beyond words, it is equivalent to one calling his mother barren.

From the above analysis of purpose of Creation, it is proved that Jehovah doesn't have characteristics of God.

Material Cause

Oh! Christian preachers,

Does not your Bible say that Jehovah created the world out of void? Cause should always precede an effect. The effect is, however, contained in latent form in the cause and it becomes manifest when efficient cause¹² comes into action later. For instance, the pot was in latent form in the clay and it became manifest when the potter created it out of clay. Bible mentions only efficient cause (Jehovah) for Creation which is an effect and is silent about material cause of Creation. This is no way logical.

If it is argued that God could create the world out of void because He is omnipotent, it doesn't fit. Omnipotence is the power to make everything function smoothly without any obstacles. Doing thing in an improper way instead of adopting right means is not a sign of omnipotence. For instance, to put a mountain within a mustard seed without changing their respective vastness and smallness is not possible. Not doing such a feat, doesn't strip God of His

¹² 'Efficient cause' of an 'effect' is the person who creates it using 'material cause'.

omnipotence. Otherwise, just because God doesn't have the power to create another omnipotent God or to destroy Himself, He would be deemed not omnipotent. Since this would not be acceptable to you, creating world from a material cause would not take away God's omnipotence.

If it is said that God Himself is both material cause and efficient cause of the world, it is not logical. Logic is that an effect is a modified material cause. Just as the thread used to weave a white cloth should itself be white, the God, who is the material cause of the world which is both sentient and insentient, should necessarily possess these characteristics. This is possible because one cannot possess opposite qualities at the same time.

Were God to be part sentient and part insentient, He would be comprised of parts, hence an effect and would cease to be the supreme cause. As per the basic dictum in logic, यद्यत् सावयवम् तत्तत् कार्यम्, यथा घटपटादि, whatever is made up of parts is an effect such as pot, cloth, etc. From the above analysis of material cause of Creation, it is proved that Jehovah doesn't have characteristics of God.

Initial Creation

Oh! Christian preachers,

Why did Jehovah create the primeval man and woman devoid of discrimination? Had they discrimination, why did they eat the forbidden fruit and fail to know that to refrain from doing forbidden things is right and to do them is wrong? Why weren't they initially bestowed with the knowledge of good and evil that they gained after eating the forbidden fruit?

Why did Jehovah plant a useless tree in the Garden of Eden where they were sent to live though they had no discrimination? Suppose a father brings home a pretty looking poisonous fruit, bids his children to stay away from it and in his absence the children get tempted, eat the fruit and fall sick, will you blame the children instead of the father? Similarly, would not the blame for the primeval man and woman turning sinners fall Jehovah instead of the man and woman?

Is Jehovah justified in not killing the man and woman after they ate the fruit forbidden by Him (though on eating the fruit they were to die on the same day)? If it was out of compassion for the man

and woman, why didn't omniscient Jehovah foresee the events?

If eating forbidden fruit was to give knowledge of good and evil, is it not cheating on the part of Jehovah that He did not want them to acquire this knowledge? If it is said that it was not so, the tree had no power of bestowing such knowledge and that it was merely a symbol to indicate that abiding by Jehovah's commands is good and violating them is evil, this interpretation not being contained in the scripture cannot be accepted. The scripture further says, "*After eating the forbidden fruit, their eyes opened*".

Why did Jehovah plant that tree in the Garden of Eden and forbid the man and woman from eating its fruit? If His purport was to make them realize that to obey His commands is good and to disobey them is bad, why did He give this command which was of no use to either Himself or others?

Had God provided them with discrimination at the time of creating them, they would have known that God is the ultimate cause and that it is good to obey Him and bad to violate. The tree of knowledge then becomes redundant.

If Jehovah forbade man from eating the fruit of the tree in order to know whether or not the man would obey his command, it would mean He

lacked foreknowledge and was, therefore, not omniscient.

If it is argued that Jehovah had given free will to man and man alone is responsible for his mistakes and that Jehovah was not to be blamed, it is not acceptable. For, if a father allows freedom to his innocent children and the children commit grave mistakes, who is to blame, the children or the father? Is He justified in giving freedom to persons devoid of discrimination? Can Satan have power to beguile and to bring to harm the man whom Jehovah created in His own image? If Jehovah was absent when Satan tempted the woman, it is evident that Jehovah is not omnipresent. If He was not aware of that Satan was to tempt the woman, it is evident that Jehovah is not omniscient. If He knew about Satan's intention, but failed to prevent the happenings, it is evident that Jehovah is not omnipotent. If He was aware of the happenings and allowed them to take place, it is evident that Jehovah is without compassion.

Can he who, even after seeing his child being attacked by a beast, does not try his best to rescue the child and remains quiet, be called a father? Never! Is it justified to consider Jehovah as father of all beings?

If intention of Jehovah was to punish Satan and redeem the man later, it can be deemed as an

eccentric act, since it is unwise to acquire both disease and medicine.

It is said that it was Satan who spoiled man's mind. If it is so, there should have been an evil spirit who should have spoiled an angel's mind and turned him into Satan. Since there was no such spirit in existence at that time, Jehovah should be the evil spirit who spoiled everyone.

Why did Jehovah curse the serpents as a whole while it was Satan who came in the form of serpent and beguiled men?

Is it justified that the innocent serpents were victims of the curse whereas the actual culprits, i.e. Satan, the tree of knowledge and Jehovah who created them received no such curse?

While it was only the primeval men who disobeyed Jehovah's command, why did He decide to extend the curse on all their descendants?

And the LORD was sorry that he had made humankind on the earth, and it grieved him to his heart. He was sorry that He made them - Genesis 6:6, 7. Having created men of His own accord, why should Jehovah feel sorry about that?

His sadness over the degradation of men from pure souls to sinners is understandable. After all, Men only turned into sinners and did not cause any other harm. But, in the case of Satan who was initially an angel created by God, not only did the

angel sin and turn himself into Satan but he turned men also into sinners. Thus Jehovah ought to have felt sad about the grave misdeeds of Satan, which he did not, but He chose to worry about men's deeds. Why is it so? It can be concluded that if Jehovah could not foresee, at the time of creation, the occurrence of these troubles, He is not omniscient, if He had the foreknowledge of these events, He is devoid of compassion and His later repentance is only pretence.

If one knows the certain events will take place in certain manner, will he not decide a definite course of action to be taken to achieve the end? If so, won't everything happen as planned by Jehovah and not go awry? If it goes wrong won't it mean that Jehovah is devoid of omniscience and omnipotence? If nothing has gone wrong, it would mean that things happened as per Jehovah's design. So, there is no justice at all in attributing all sins to men instead of to Jehovah.

There is scriptural evidence that everything was predetermined by God –

According as he hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love - Ephesians 1-4, In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will -

Ephesians 1:11, And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose - Romans 8:28, For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren - Romans 8:29, Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified - Romans 8:30, Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain - Acts 2:23, What if God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction; And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory - Romans 9:22,23, But we are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth - Thessalonians 2:2:13.

It can be seen from the above that Jehovah had decided that things should occur in a certain manner. It is therefore clear that all ill occurrences took place just as designed by Jehovah. Therefore, punishing the souls for the sins committed Jehovah is grave injustice.

From the above analysis of 'initial creation', it is proved that Jehovah doesn't have characteristics of God.

Evil Qualities

Oh! Christian preachers,

Not only have you falsely assigned Jehovah with divine qualities like omniscience, etc which He did not possess, but you also concealed evil qualities like revengefulness, anger, jealousy, cruelty, praise-loving, worry, dishonesty, etc which He actually possessed.

We shall proceed to prove with the help of the Bible, which you hold as true, that Jehovah possesses all the above evil qualities.

From the following it can be seen that Jehovah was jealous –

I am a Jealous God - Exodus 20:5, you shall worship no other god: for the LORD, whose name is Jealous - Exodus 34:14, Jehovah is a jealous God - Joshua 24:19.

From the following it can be seen that Jehovah was angry:

There is wrath gone out from the LORD; the plague is begun - Numbers 16:46, Now therefore let me alone, that my wrath may wax hot against them, and that I may consume them - Exodus 32:10.

From the following it can be seen that Jehovah was envious:

And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever. Therefore the LORD God sent him forth from the Garden of Eden - Genesis 3:22, 23. Noticing the people trying to build a very tall tower, Jehovah felt that will achieve great fame due this act and He broke their unity and scattered them (Genesis 11).

From the following it can be seen that Jehovah was cruel:

Jehovah killed all the first-born lives in Egypt - Exodus 12, With the intention of enhancing His own glory, Jehovah made Pharaoh hard heartened, made him disobey Jehovah and killed Pharaoh and his army by drowning them in the sea - Exodus 14. Jehovah killed two sons of Aaron when they appeared in His presence- Leviticus 16:1, the LORD smote Nabal, that he died- Samuel 1:25-38. Further He caused riots amidst Israelites and other tribes and decimated several lives.

It is said in many places in the Bible that Jehovah strove to enhance His glory. So, it is evident that He was prone to praise.

Jehovah was pleased after Creation and later repented for His creation. This shows that He was not free from sadness. He blessed the midwives Shiprah and Puah even though spoke lie – Exodus

1. Since it is said that Jehovah sent a person to utter a lie which caused the death of Ahab and his army, it becomes evident that Jehovah is dishonest (1Kings 22).

From the following it can be seen that Jehovah was evil:

Jehovah instigated Israelites to flee with jewels borrowed from their neighbours – Exodus 11. When David forcefully married the widow of Uriah, Jehovah commanded David's wives to sleep with the neighbour – 2Samuel 12. Instead of punishing Abraham and Isaac who spoke lies, Jehovah blessed them – Genesis 22, 26. The LORD said to Hosea, Go, take unto thee a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredoms: for the land hath committed great whoredom, departing from the LORD – Hosea 1:2.

I consider that the above instances are adequate and end my argument in this context. If I am to dwell further on the evil qualities, actions and utterances of Jehovah, it will be too elaborate.

Image of God

It is said that Jehovah created man in His own image (Genesis 1:26, 27). Is He formless or has He a form? If He is formless, the man created in His own image should also have been formless. Since man has a form, Jehovah should also have a form.

If 'image' stands for the soul and not the body, did Jehovah create man's body or soul or both? Since it is said in the Bible, *And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul* – Genesis 2:7, and man was created in Jehovah's own image and soul, being the breath of God, was already there and was not created, it was the body and not the soul that Jehovah created.

If 'image' stands for knowledge, the things will become more complicated. For, if man was created in the form of knowledge, will not the knowledge shine in the man? If it shone, will not the man be able to differentiate between good and evil? If he was so able, will he be tempted at the words of his woman? Never! So, 'image' stands for body and not for knowledge.

Besides, if 'image' stands for knowledge, it will mean that the knowledge the man possessed before eating the forbidden fruit was only the

knowledge Jehovah had and that Jehovah did not have the knowledge which man acquired after eating the fruit. In case, Jehovah was in possession of this knowledge, He did not have it naturally but should have acquired it after eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge.

And they heard the voice of the LORD God walking in the garden in the cool of the day – Genesis 3:8. Since Jehovah preferred cool of the day it can be presumed that He differentiates between heat and cold, sorrow and joy, etc.

There are many more such instances. But, we will set them aside.

Based on the above discussions it can be concluded that Jehovah doesn't possess the characteristics of God. Therefore, Hebrew appellations such as *Elohim* meaning 'venerable, glorious', *Elion* meaning 'lord of all', *Jehovah* meaning 'self-created, living one, immutable, one without beginning or end' and *Shaddai* meaning 'overlord, supreme judge' and Greek appellations such as *Theos* meaning 'God' and *Kurios* meaning 'creator' do not at all befit Jehovah.

Life of Christ

We shall now demonstrate that Jesus Christ also does not possess divinity at all.

Josephus was the historian who recorded the events as they took place during Jesus' life time in European continent. If Jesus actually lived at that time and had astounded the public through miracles like bringing the dead back to life, would Josephus omit to record these facts in his work? Perhaps he didn't come to know of these facts. Even then, would he fail to notice the transformation of day into night at the time of crucifixion of Christ? Even if he had so failed, would he fail to remember the Earthquake that took place at the time of crucifixion? Besides, why the year, month and date of birth of Jesus were left out to be specified in the Bible? Nor does the Bible contain the date of crucifixion, which is an occurrence more important than his birth. Based on the appearance of a new star at the time of his birth, it should be possible to determine the time of his birth. None of the astronomers from places like India, China, Persia and Europe have recorded the appearance of such a star. Therefore it cannot be

said conclusively that a person named Jesus ever lived.

Assuming that Jesus actually lived, was anything especially noticeable in him from birth unlike normal children? Was he born without being conceived in the womb of a woman? Was his birth marked by any world famous miracle? Were there any miracles not so famous? Was he born, unlike ordinary children, with extra heads or hands? Did he get up and walk as soon as he was born and start preaching? Did he grow up without any hunger, thirst, sleep or nature's calls? His birth was so inauspicious that first, his mother was suspected of her chastity and second, three thousand children below two years got killed and the entire region turned bleak due to this great sorrow of the people. Will the birth of the son of God make the people grieve instead of rejoicing? Never! Therefore like any other human being, he remained confined in mother's womb, underwent all the pains of birth, took birth as per past *karma*, caused suffering to people and committed blasphemy after he grew up, wandered many places and was crucified at the age of thirty three for his grave sins, moaned aloud in indescribable pain and died. It is evident from the above that he was more sinful than any ordinary soul.

But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father – Mark 13:32. It is evident from the above that there is only one omniscient God (Father) and Jesus does not possess this power and so Jesus is not omniscient.

If it is contended that besides divine nature (divinity)¹³ Jesus had human nature (humanity) comprising of hunger, thirst and other weaknesses and that he is referred in the Bible as son of God and son of man as well and that as per the above quotation it is the angels in Heaven and the son (implying son of man) that lacked the knowledge and not the son of God, this is not testified so in Bible. Without admitting that Jesus lacked the knowledge, if you go on arguing thus unreasonably, it would be utter folly as can be seen from the following.

If you contend that since the term 'son of God' does not appear in the above quotation, the lack of knowledge should not be attributed to the divine nature of Jesus, the same should not be attributed to his human nature as the term 'son of man' also does not appear in the above quotation. Besides, in the absence of specific mention of either

¹³ One central Christian doctrine (for most branches) is that Jesus Christ has two natures: humanity and divinity, Christ is at once both fully human and fully divine.

‘God’ or ‘man’ in connection with the ‘son’, the lack of knowledge should not be attributed to either divine or human nature but to a ‘mere nature’ of Jesus. This will mean that Jesus had a third nature in addition to his divine and human natures. This is in contradiction to Bible.

There can, therefore, be no second opinion about Jesus not having omniscience. I can quote another instance to support this stand.

And seeing a fig tree afar off having leaves, he came, if haply he might find anything thereon: and when he came to it, he found nothing but leaves; for the time of figs was not yet – Mark 11:13. From this sentence also it can be seen that Jesus, like any ordinary human being, had to go near the tree to find whether it bore fruits and that he did not possess omniscience.

If you say that this is as an allegory by Jesus i.e. Jesus’ seeing from a distance the fig tree having leaves is to be taken for Jesus’ seeing from Heaven the prosperous city of Jerusalem, his going near the tree hoping to find fruits is to be taken for his coming to Jerusalem and searching in its citizens for the virtues like justice, kindness and faith, his finding only leaves and no fruits in the tree is to be taken for his not finding no such virtues in them who were putting up, with no faith, a show of observing rituals, his cursing the tree not to bear

fruits any longer is to be taken for his cursing Jerusalem to perish without a trace and the withering of the tree soon is to be taken for impending annihilation of Jerusalem, this stand of yours will only strengthen my contention that Jesus was not omniscient. The sign of omniscience is the ability to know, without having to look at Jerusalemites, the fact that Jerusalemites were merely putting up a show of being religious and that they did not have virtues like justice, kindness and faith. Jesus did not come to know this fact even after looking at them from Heaven. He had to go to Jerusalem to find this out. If this is to be taken as a sign of omniscience, everyone can be said to be omniscient. Is it not a gross injustice to curse Jerusalem? Since endowing men with virtues like faith is the responsibility of Holy Ghost, should not Jesus have cursed Holy Ghost who failed to endow the citizens of Jerusalem with virtues? Cursing the fig tree tops his eccentricities. How can it be said that Jesus came to possess omniscience and discrimination on Earth when he never had these qualities while he was in Heaven itself?

And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him – Luke 22:43, Jesus, out of fear of Jews, moved about in stealth (John 11). From these it is can be seen that he is devoid of omnipotence and freedom.

(Jesus) began to be sorrowful and very heavy. Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death – Matt 26:37. Since it can be seen from the above that Jesus lacked equanimity and that he was timid to face sorrow and was desirous of joy, he was not ever-joyful.

Jehovah Himself has uttered the following about Jesus: Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased – Matt 12:18. Jesus himself says: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord – Luke 13:35. From the above it is evident that Jesus was a mere servant of Jehovah and was liked and blessed by Him.

Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit – Luke 23:46, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt – Matt 26-39. Since Jesus himself has said the above words, it is clear that there is a Father who is the owns and protects the soul of Jesus, that Jesus is not God, that nothing happen as per Jesus' will and that he has to plead to God if it should happen. It is also said in Bible that when people jeered at Jesus seeing him suffering on the cross, he cried in a loud voice, *Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? That is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* – Matt 27:46. So, it is evident that, like any ordinary man, Jesus was scared of death, that because he

cried out aloud, he didn't have the courage and strength to bear the agony and that because he was devoted to a demigod who was not omnipotent, his faith and prayer did not bear fruit and he was rendered helpless.

It is also said in Bible that when mother of Zebedees children prayed to Jesus to bless¹⁴ her sons he replied, *"to sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father"* - Matt 20:20-23. Thus, Jesus himself admits that he cannot, at his will, grant anyone's desires. Considering these facts, it is certain that Jesus was a mere slave of the God, he served Him, attained glory in His name, laid his life at His feet and acted as per His will and command.

If it is argued that Jesus had both human and divine natures and that all the above facts relate to his human nature, it is untenable. It is said in Bible that when Jesus was baptised Holy Spirit, in the form of a dove, entered into him making him omnipresent, that he was made powerful by an angel, that he was described as a servant by God and that when he was crucified he cried aloud why God forsook him. Had Jesus possessed divine nature apart from his human nature, all the above

¹⁴ by seating them by his side in his kingdom

incidents need not have happened. Trying to prove, without adequate grounds, that a person, who grew up as an ordinary man and went around preaching ordinary matters, was of divine nature, is not at all acceptable.

If it is contended that statements of Jehovah that Jesus is His son and He is father of Jesus are enough to establish that Jesus possessed divine nature, this cannot be accepted for the following reasons.

When Jews asked Jesus why he, being a man, committed blasphemy by calling himself God, he replied, *“Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken; Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?”* – John 10:33-36. *Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God* – John 20:17. Is not this single statement of Jesus sufficient to prove beyond doubt that he is not God? It is evident that God of Jesus was same as the God of others and father of Jesus and father of others were one and the same. Jehovah has also uttered *“for I am a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my firstborn”* – Jeremiah 31:9. Such utterances are

found at several places in Bible. Jehovah calling Jesus as His son was a mere formality just as He called many others His sons and there is no apparent special reason to consider Jesus as the only Son of God. If one has to accept Jesus as God just because he is called son by Jehovah, all the others would also have to be accepted as Gods, amongst whom Ephraim, the eldest son of God, will be deemed to be the eldest God and Jesus, the last in this line, the youngest God. This will amount to there being many Gods and be a matter of ridicule.

If it is contended that Jesus was born to Virgin Mary without a union with her husband and hence he is divine, since Mary conceived after her marriage to Joseph, how can it be said that she conceived without any contact with her husband or any other man? If Joseph and Mary led an ascetic life not needing any physical contact, what was the necessity of their getting married? *And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son* – Matthew 1:25. *After this he went down to Capernaum, he, and his mother, and his brethren, and his disciples* – John 2:12. From the fact that Joseph did unite with Mary till she delivered her first child, it is evident that they united later. From the above term “his mother and his brethren” it is clear that Joseph and Mary had the desire for physical

union and did not refrain from physical contact after the birth of Jesus and in all possibility they also lived so before the birth of Jesus. Moreover ever since their marriage they lived together in the same house. How did you come to know that they refrained yet from physical contact? If they had stated so, it should be with view to shield their pride or for some other reason. Your claim that Jesus was born to a virgin is, therefore, incorrect.

O disciples of Jesus, how can one believe the stories fabricated by you to glorify your master many years after death of Jesus?

Since it is a pure lie that Jesus was born to Mary without any male contact, he cannot be considered as God owing to his virgin birth. Even assuming that he had a virgin birth, Jesus can utmost be considered as special amongst men and it will an overdoing to assign Godhood to a person born out of a womb.

You say that Jesus was born untouched by inherited sin (janmapapasambandham). Since it is a divine rule that the original sin will invariably pass on from primeval man to all his descendants, Jesus should automatically inherit the sin as per the above divine order, as he was born to Mary, a descendant of primeval man. If you say that Jesus was pure and so he did not inherit sin, it is not at all reasonable, for, God is impartial and all the

souls which are pure before taking birth are said to inherit sin on their birth and Jesus cannot be an exception. Jesus was dependent on the Grace of God as can be seen from his appeal to God, *"O God, why did you forsake me?"* and *"Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit"*. Even after a searching the Bible umpteen times, one cannot locate a single statement by Jesus that he is God himself. On what authority do you, therefore, state that Jesus is God?

If you say that Jesus did not like to say himself that he is God, why do you go on repeating this nonsense much to his dislike?

Why did Jesus go on calling himself son of man? No man goes on saying that he is a man. Some of you, therefore, say that there is a special reason for Jesus calling himself son of man.

Yes, I accept, there can be a special reason. Jesus, a carpenter, cornered some illiterate labourers and preached to them that he is son of God and was sent by God. This incurred the anger of Jews who wanted to punish him. Jesus was apprehensive of his getting arrested and punished by them. He, therefore, called himself son of man in order to appease them. This should only be the special reason. In Bible we come across many instances where Jesus goes in hiding to escape being caught by Jews.

For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom – Matthew 16:27, 28. So says Jesus.

From the above it is clear that as per Bible 1890¹⁵ years ago when Jesus lived in this world, he spoke to some people that some of them would live to see the end of the world and the day of Judgement.

Is anyone of those people still alive? If alive, they should be at least 1890 years old. Since none so old lives now and since more than 1790 years would have lapsed after all of them died and since the end of world and the day of judgement are yet to come, we can certainly say this statement of Jesus was nothing but a fib.

In Europe in the year 1000 AD many Christians believed in the above statement of Jesus and feared that the end of the world was very near made wide propaganda of this by publishing letters. On learning about this, many Christians went to priests and sought refuge. A General with an army, upon seeing a solar eclipse, concluded, “Oh! The end of world has begun. That is why the

¹⁵ This book was published in 1890

Sun is disappearing. Bit by bit, the whole world will come to an end.” He got frightened and ran helter-skelter along with his army. At the same time, many people, abandoning their relatives and property, converged to Palestine believing that Jesus will appear there to save them. In those times, whenever solar or lunar eclipse occurred, people used to flee from homes and hide themselves in the caves. This misfortune befell on them owing to their lack of knowledge of astronomy and geography and undue belief in the words of Jesus whom they revered as God. Even in modern times, the situation is no better. In 1881, some missionaries created public scare by writing off and on in inconsequential magazines about imminent arrival of Jesus. Even though none believed such news, this did not detract the missionaries from continuing to spread such news. From the above arguments, one can conclude that Jesus is not God and one will not at all gain, through Jesus, any happiness either in this world or the next (ihaparaloka¹⁶).

Now, we shall examine what Jesus opines about this matter. *Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven –*

¹⁶ On the Earth or in Heaven or Hell

Matthew 7:21. It is clear from the above quote that Jesus himself admits that he is not God and that no one will enter Heaven just by calling Jesus 'Lord'.

And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God – Matthew 19:17. When a person said that Jesus was good Jesus countered him that no one is good except God. What more needs to be said in this connection? If this is not enough to prove that Jesus is not God, you may refer to passages about Trinity in the Bible. If you contend that Jesus said so because Jesus could gauge the minds of people and he knew that the person calling him good did not believe that Jesus was God, this explanation is not supported by Bible. Even if Bible supports this, it is certain that Jesus was not capable of knowing the minds of others. Because Jesus made Judas his disciple without knowing that Judas would take money and betray him and as soon as he knew about the betrayal by Judas, Jesus was greatly distressed and cursed him. There are many more such instances and we shall consider them later in this work.

If you contend that Jesus can be deemed to be God in view of the various miracles he performed, we shall examine to find out whether Jesus really performed all those miracles.

First, Jesus won over Satan and drove him away. If one tries to find out who this Satan was and who created him, Bible is totally silent about this. Bible commentators say that in the beginning of creation God created thousands of angels and cursed those angels who did not submit to His will and Satan is one such cursed angel. From where did these commentators obtain this knowledge which is found nowhere in the Bible. Did any angel reveal this knowledge to them in their dreams just as an angel spoke to Joseph in his dream? Even if the story about Satan is accepted, Jesus cannot still be accepted as God.

Is it not due to God that Satan fell to lower region? Were Jesus God, will Satan dare come near him? Would not have Satan either fled at the sight of Jesus or approached Jesus and fallen at his feet? When people possessed with evil spirits come to the altar of demigods like *Madan*, *Kali*, *Ayyanar*, and *Sangili Bhootathan* will not the spirits, releasing hold on those persons, flee wailing "Oh, I am willing leave and here I go"? On the contrary, Satan was least hesitant to lay hold on Jesus. In support of his you may refer to Matthew 4:1-4, Luke 4:1-13.

It may be seen therein that Satan caught hold of Jesus, made him starve, dragged him to many places and bid him to bow down to Satan. Thus,

evident that Jesus had no power either to deter Satan from approaching him or to stop Satan from bothering him or to drive him away at the very outset.

If you deny this and contend based on , “Then was Jesus led up of the spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil” – Matthew 4:1, it was only with the permission of Holy Spirit that Satan caught hold of Jesus to test him, the following questions arise. Why at all did the Holy Spirit lead Jesus to wilderness to be tested by Satan? Did the Holy Spirit imagine that people would believe in Jesus when after passing all tests by Satan he is certified by Satan as son of God? As per the principle of Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one. It would mean that Son is not different from Father and Father is not different from Holy Spirit. That Son was subjected to Satan’s tests would mean that Father and Holy Spirit as well were tested.

That God allowed Satan to test Jesus (and therefore Himself) would mean that God felt that Satan may be more powerful than Him, was not sure that Satan was weaker than Him and may be, He felt that this was a sure way of making people believe in Jesus.

Let us now examine what Satan’s tests were and whether Jesus really passed them. When,

finding Jesus hungry, Satan asked him to order the stone to turn into bread, Jesus did no such thing. Is this passing the test? What else did Jesus do then? He merely said that man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God. Why did he utter such folly and why did he not convert the stones into bread? It was not because he was not hungry. He was hungry as can be seen from *“And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterward an hungred”* – Matthew 4:2. If it was because he had conquered hunger, how is it he became hungry in the wilderness especially when nothing was available to eat? If Jesus was capable of appeasing hunger with the words of God, as he claimed in his reply to Satan, why didn't he make use of this 'divine remedy' to appease his hunger when he was suffering from hunger that made him lose his temper and curse the fig tree? Had Jesus tried this remedy and failed, it would mean that his reply to Satan (Matthew 4:4) is an utter lie. He did not turn stones into bread neither because he was not hungry nor because he had control over his hunger nor because he did not want to turn the stones into bread. It was only because he did not possess any divine or even magical power. His words,

sometimes, were reminiscent of the proverb¹⁷ “making faces (grimace) when one is dumbfounded”. What was then Satan’s next test? He carried Jesus to the pinnacle of a temple, bid him to jump down from there saying that angels would be there to protect him. Jesus did nothing this time also. How can you still say that Jesus vanquished Satan? Did he give any reply to Satan like he did earlier? Yes. Jesus told Satan that scriptures ordain us not to tempt Lord the God. What an absurd thing to say so! Why didn’t Jesus jump when he was challenged by Satan? If it is said that it was out of patience, why did this embodiment of patience sometimes unjustly curse and utter unkind words? It was not out of patience that Jesus did not jump; he was in fact scared of doing so. If you contend that Satan tested Jesus as ordained by Holy Spirit, it was certainly the duty of Satan to test Jesus and it was duty of Jesus to come out as a winner instead of evading the tests. Didn't Jesus, then, go against the will of Holy Spirit and the God by dodging Satan's tests and saying meaningless words?

If Jesus was at least bestowed with divine Grace, couldn't he have jumped believing in the angels to come to his protection? Or couldn't he

¹⁷ The author is referring to a proverb in Malayalam

have, by his glory, either pushed Satan down or make Satan have an illusion of Jesus jumping? But, he did none of these.

Satan caught hold of Jesus, twirled him like a top, took him to the top of mountain, showed him all the kingdoms and said, "If you kneel at my feet, I shall give all these to you". Trembling with fear, Jesus could merely utter meaningless words. Had he vanquished and chastised Satan we could have deemed Jesus to be a victor and saviour. In fact it was not Jesus who vanquished Satan but it was vice versa. Therefore, it is certain that Trinity - Father, Son and Holy Ghost - is weaker than Satan. How can one who failed to win Satan be God? Is not Satan, who, out of pity, let off Jesus without any disgrace, more compassionate than Jehovah?

Once some evil spirits, that possessed a man, demanded one thousand swine as their food in order to leave the man, Jesus agreed to meet this undue demand and the evil spirits then killed one thousand swine by drowning them in the sea¹⁸. What a great loss to the owner of the swine!¹⁹ What an instance of Jesus' divinity!

Once Jesus, in the throes of hunger, cursed a fig tree as it didn't give him fruits and it withered

¹⁸ Mark 5:13

¹⁹ No mention is made of what happened to the poor pig-hearder whose livelihood must have been ruined - *Translator*

at once. This is indeed a great miracle! How can a tree bear fruits out of season? Even during season, one will have to pluck them from the tree. How can a tree guess one's need and give fruits to him? Is it not as per laws of God that all trees bloom and bear fruits in the proper season? If Jesus were God, isn't he the cause for the tree for having no fruit? So, why did he, instead of cursing himself, curse the tree for no fault of it? Was his hunger so agonising that he lost his temper? How could Jesus, who could not contain hunger even for a day, fast for forty days? It is certainly a lie. If it is contended that Jesus could bear hunger but only to show his glory to his disciples he cursed the tree, it would have been real glory had he made the tree bear fruits. It would have appeased the hunger of Jesus and his disciples and strengthened their faith in him. It seems, Jesus never knew to do right things at right time. If at all he fasted for forty days, it was not of his accord. In fact he was forced to starve because neither anyone brought him food nor could he go in search of food as Satan detained him in the wilderness.

Assuming that Jesus walked over water, this cannot be considered as a miracle. This technique

called “Jalastambham²⁰” is, nowadays, known even to ordinary men.

It is also seen that Jesus performed many such feats which magicians, medics and mesmerisers do nowadays. We shall not enter into their details as they are insignificant.

If it is contented that Jesus must be viewed as God since he brought the dead back to life, it is certain that he did not resurrect anyone vide the statements in Acts 26:23 and Revelations 1:5 which say that Jesus is the first amongst those who rose from the dead. Had Jesus resurrected anyone at all, that person would be the first amongst those who rose from the dead and Jesus the last amongst them because it is not at all said anywhere in the Bible that Jesus resurrected anyone after he himself rose from the dead.

If it is contended that Jesus is the first amongst those who came to life from the dead and not first amongst those who were brought back to life from the dead, everyone brought back to life from the dead, is also one who came to life from the dead. When one says, “I woke up yesterday night hearing the sound of thunder”, that means that though his waking up was caused by the

²⁰ To stand or walk on water – this is one of the psychic powers acquired by Yogic practices

sound of thunder, he woke up by himself. Similarly, one who is brought back to life from the dead is also one who came back to life from the dead.

Next, did Jesus come back to life from the dead by his own power? Not at all! Jesus was brought back to life by God as can be seen from the following: *we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead* - Romans 4:24, *God hath raised him from the dead* - Romans 10:9, *whom God hath raised from the dead* - Acts 3:15, (In the following references from Corinthians-15, the former mentions about resurrection of Christ without attributing it to any agency while the latter mentions about his resurrection by God²¹) *if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead* - 1Corinthians 15:12, *we have testified of God that he raised up Christ* - 1Corinthians 15:15. If the Biblical statement 'Jesus was the first among those, who rose from the dead' is true, those Biblical statements which say that 'he raised the dead' can only be false.

If it is contended that Jesus is God because he died as sacrifice for the sins of all souls, the following questions arise. To which God was he offered as sacrifice? Who killed him as sacrifice?

²¹ This implies that all the apostles and saints who mentioned about Christ's resurrection were aware that it was God who raised Jesus from the dead.

There was no sacrifice as such. In fact Jews caught hold of Jesus and killed him for his crimes. Jews wouldn't have killed him unless he was guilty.

Had Jesus incarnated willingly on Earth to become sacrifice for the sins of all souls, why did he go into hiding instead of moving openly among the Jews? If he was not hiding, why is it said in John 11:57 that *both the chief priests and the Pharisees had given a commandment, that, if any man knew where he (Jesus) were, he should show it, that they might take him?* Why couldn't they find him even after issue of such an order? It is, therefore, certain that he moved incognito. In the end, as his fear increased, he grew restless, moved away to a hideout. If this was not due to fear, why, in John 11:53-54, is it said, *'then from that day forth they took counsel together for to put him to death. Jesus therefore walked no more openly among the Jews; but went thence unto a country near to the wilderness, into a city called Ephraim, and there continued with his disciples?'* In John 8:58-59, it is also said, *'then they took up stones to cast at him: but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed by'.* and in Luke 4:29-30, *'And all they in the synagogue, when they heard these things, were filled with wrath, And rose up, and thrust him out of the city, and led him unto the brow of the hill whereon their city*

was built, that they might cast him down headlong. But he passing through the midst of them went his way'.

If it is further contended that it was decided by the Father and agreed upon by the son that Jesus ought to suffer and die on the day of Passover Festival, when all Israelites and people belonging to other tribes would gather, so that on the Day of Judgement nobody could plead that they didn't know that a saviour had come to the Earth, suffered and died for them (because it is not sufficient if Jesus suffers before only a few persons like other martyrs) and that Jesus had to hide himself so that he would die on the day of Passover, the Bible does not bear testimony to this. Besides, if, as you opine, the Father wished that the whole world ought to know of the suffering of Jesus, did the whole world come to know of this? Does the whole world know of this now? Will the whole world know of this in times to come? Countless men in various countries have died without even hearing the name of Jesus. Many more will most likely die like this. This implies that the Father made no such wish. Since this wish of the Father has not come to pass, we can't be sure that all His other wishes will come to pass. Had God wished only people of that region to know of the suffering of Jesus, why do you make it your mission to spread the gospel in other parts of the

world? Besides, since you said that Jesus did not want to suffer before the time as decided by the Father, it would imply that Jesus didn't at all undergo suffering willingly, he underwent suffering by the decision of the Father and that he would never have undergone suffering had it not been ordained by the Father.

Furthermore, had the Father fixed a time for Jesus to suffer, Jesus would not have to suffer before this time. Why, then, did he hide himself before this time came? If Jesus hid himself because he was not aware that a time for his suffering had been fixed by the Father, it would imply that Jesus gave no consent to undergo suffering and die. So, it is certain that Jesus underwent suffering neither for the sake of other souls nor out of his free will. His suffering was brought about by his fate.

If you say that, though Jesus knew of the Father's decision that Jesus ought to suffer, Jesus did not know the time set for this and so Jesus went into hiding, it would imply that Jesus hid from Jews out of nothing but fear. If Jesus did not know the exact day of his suffering, shouldn't he have hidden himself on the day he was caught? On the other hand, he did not even try to escape but he allowed the Jews to arrest him. Why did he do so? Why didn't he use his 'power of vanishing' which he is said to have used on many occasions? You

cannot conclude that it was in submission to the will of the Father that Jesus went into hiding initially and subsequently surrendered to the Jews, because you say yourself that he was unaware of the day set for his suffering. In fact Jesus didn't try to escape when Jews apprehended him because there was no chance of escape. There was neither a decision by the Father to sacrifice Jesus as sin offering nor any day set for his suffering nor did Jesus know of this decision nor did he give his consent to the Father.

Had Jesus possessed any knowledge or belief that God had decided to give him as sin offering in sacrifice, he would not have gone into hiding. Otherwise, why didn't Jesus bless Judas who betrayed him instead of cursing, *'woe unto that man, by whom the Son of man is betrayed! It had been good for that man if he had not been born'* (Matthew 26:24)? If it is argued that Jesus merely pointed out the truth so that Judas is not let off without admonition for his betrayal, the curse ought to have been directed at God, who was the root cause of all the happenings. Since Jesus did not do so, this curse was indeed due to grief.

If it is contended that all-knowing Jesus, out of his divine nature, cursed Judas with a view to reveal beforehand the betrayal by Judas, it is obvious that Jesus did not possess foreknowledge

as he had earlier accepted Judas as his apostle without realising that Judas would betray him. If Jesus had done so knowingly, the blame for the betrayal would also fall upon him. In any case, if one is to be cursed at all, should it not be Jehovah, the root cause of all his suffering? So, all these explanations for Judas alone to be blamed do not fit.

Jesus, like anyone in a similar situation, could have anticipated his impending misfortune in the nick of time. So, it is a lie to say that he had foreknowledge.

Now, was the reason for Jesus' suffering the betrayal by Judas or the resolve of God or both? If the cause was the betrayal by Judas, death of Jesus was certainly not a sin offering. If the cause was God's resolve, Judas, who acted in accordance with God's will, cannot be called a sinner and condemned to Hell. If both were the cause, it is a gross injustice to label one as good and the other as evil. Having been betrayed by Judas, while in hiding in fear, Jesus did curse him with a vengeful heart. From the above, it is proved that Jesus did not die as 'sin offering'.

Earlier we saw that Jesus did not come back to life himself but was brought back to life by God. Now, we shall prove that God too didn't bring him back to life and that after dying on the cross, Jesus

never came back to life. Paul says in 1Corinthians 15:17 *'And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sin'*. Since resurrection of Christ is a basic tenet in Christian faith, I am writing another book on Resurrection. So, this topic is dealt with here in brief. To examine whether or not Jesus resurrected, it is essential to look for any contemporary witness of this incident. All the Jews who lived during that period have averred that this is an utter lie. We shall look for testimony in the Bible. None of the apostles say that they have witnessed it themselves. They merely quote others who had witnessed. *And when they* (eleven disciples) *saw him, they worshipped him: but some doubted* – Matthew 28:17. Matthew was one the eleven disciples who saw Jesus after resurrection, but we do not know whether he was amongst those who doubted. Had he actually seen, why didn't he say so? He is, therefore, one of those who had doubt. But, why did some of the disciples doubt? Was it not Jesus they saw? The chief disciples accompanied and served him for years and if they themselves doubted and didn't believe in Jesus' resurrection, how can then we believe that Jesus resurrected 1890 years ago? Furthermore, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John who have mentioned that Jesus resurrected from the dead contradict one another in their gospels. I shall

illustrate this. *The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene (one person) early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre – John 20:1, In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary (two persons) to see the sepulchre – Matthew 28:1, And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they (many persons) came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun – Mark 16:1-2.*

The angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it – Matthew 28:2, And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away: for it was very great. And entering into the sepulchre, they saw a young man (not an angel) sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment; and they were affrighted – Mark 16:4-5, And it came to pass, as they were much perplexed thereabout, behold, two men (neither an angel nor a young man) stood by them in shining garments - Luke 24:4. According Luke they saw neither an angel as said by Matthew nor a young man sitting there as said by Mark. But Mary stood without at the sepulchre weeping: and as she wept, she stooped down, and looked into the sepulchre, and seeth two angels in white sitting, the one at the head,

and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain – John 20:11-12. According John the women saw neither an angel as said by Matthew nor a young man sitting as said by Mark nor two men as said by Luke.

And returned from the sepulchre, and told all these things unto the eleven, and to all the rest – Luke 24:9, And they went out quickly, and fled from the sepulchre; for they trembled and were amazed: neither said they any thing to any man; for they were afraid – Mark 16:8.

And as they went to tell his disciples, behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and held him by the feet, and worshipped him – Matthew 28:9. It is said in John 20:14 that Mary Magdalene neither touched nor recognised Jesus.

It is said in John 20:15-19 that it was Mary Magdalene who saw Jesus first after resurrection and he was seen by the 11 disciples afterwards in Jerusalem whereas Matthew 28:16-17 says that 11 disciples met Jesus in Galilee. Luke 24:50-51 says that Jesus was carried up into the heaven from Bethany where as it is said in acts 1:9-12 that Jesus was carried up into heaven from Mount Olivet.

It is said in Matthew 12:40 that Jesus prophesied that he (son of man) will be in the heart of the earth (in tomb) for three days and three nights whereas it is said in Mark 14:25-46 that he

remained in the tomb only for a day and two nights. Since all the four writers of gospels contradict thus one another, their narrations are not believable at all. What other evidence is there to support the resurrection of Jesus as the gospel accounts have already been refuted and rejected?

If it is now contended that though the authors of four gospels contradict one another's accounts of Jesus' resurrection, none of them deny that Jesus resurrected, it is not an adequate proof of the Resurrection. For instance, one person saw a white crow sitting on a desk inside a shop in a place called Attakulangara in Thiruvananthapuram from 6 in the morning till 6 in the evening, a second person saw the same crow during the same period perched on a cot in the house of a person named Kurup in a place called Vembayam, a third person saw the same crow during the same period at the palace at Shankhumukham and a fourth person saw the same crow during the same period inside the main temple in Kottarakkara. Though none of these four witnesses denied the existence of the white crow, would you accept that white crow really existed? Would you rather ridicule them? Certainly you would. This applies to resurrection as well.

From the above arguments it is evident that Jesus did not perform any of the miracles, from

vanquishing the Satan to Resurrection, described in the Bible.

Furthermore, when the Jews after arresting Jesus, blindfolded, ridiculed, then slapped him and asked him, "Who was it that hit you?" he could not name the person who had hit him. Later, when King Herod, who was exceedingly glad to meet Jesus, asked him to perform a miracle, he did nothing. After Jesus was crucified, when the chief priests, Pharisees and the elders challenged Jesus to save himself by coming down from the cross if he was really the King of Israel and that they would belief in him if he did so, Jesus merely stood like a corpse. You consider as miracles Jesus' furtive disappearance when he was about to get stoned or pushed down from the top of the mountain. If so, what happened to his divine powers with which he could have saved himself from the cross? He was in the habit of eluding the soldiers by hiding among the crowd whenever the soldiers came to arrest him. So, they took utmost care to apprehend him and he got arrested. If you say that the day of arrest was preordained by God and Jesus chose not to escape the arrest despite divine powers, everyone can be viewed to possess divine as well as human natures just like Jesus and therefore deemed God.

Even if we concede that all these miracles were performed by Jesus, he cannot be called God because Moses, Joshua, Elisha, Elias, et al were also capable of similar miracles. Furthermore, as per Exodus 7:8, when Moses, by the glory of God, performed miracles - such as turning a rod into a snake, water into blood and creating a frog - before the Pharaoh of Egypt, the royal magicians, who were unbelievers, performed the similar and even better miracles. From this it is obvious that miracles could be performed by one who is neither God nor a believer in God.

Furthermore, it is said in Matthew 24:24, '*For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect*'. So, we need not accept someone as God just because he performs miracles. There is nothing wrong in considering him as a devotee or an enemy of God. After a thorough examination of the Bible, one cannot find even a trace of evidence to prove Jesus God.

We have earlier proved with the help of valid arguments that Jesus did not rise after death. We shall now examine what his condition was after death, based on the Bible.

Hell is the eternal residence of all sinners. Since Jesus took upon himself sins of all he

becomes the greatest sinner and doesn't deserve anything other than falling into the Hell. Besides, it is said in the testimonies of apostles that Jesus went to Hell after death. So, it is certain that Jesus went to Hell.

Since it is a tenet of Christianity that there is no return for those who enter Hell, it could be reasonably concluded that Jesus also has not come back from Hell. Since this conclusion is supported by John 20:17 wherein it is said that *Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father*, it is certain that Jesus has not attained Salvation. Since Jesus has not either entered Heaven or attained Salvation, he cannot be omnipresent. Therefore, there is no evidence, either scriptural or rational or empirical, to stop one from concluding that Jesus is still suffering in eternal Hell which he deserved.

Therefore, the following names, given to Jesus in the gospel, do not befit him: *God* (John 20:28), *Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us* (Matthew 1:23), *God whose throne is forever and ever* (Hebrews 1:8), *God who is over all and is blessed for ever* (Romans 9:5), *King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God* (1Timothy 1:19), *Only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords* (1Timothy 6:15), *God who laid down his life for us* (1John 3:16), *God who purchased us with his own blood*

(Acts 20:28), *Great God* (Titus 2:13), *God who manifested in flesh* (1 Timothy 3:16), *True God* (1John 5:20), *Mighty God* (Isaiah 9:6), *God who is Word* (John 1;1), *Lord of lords* (Revelations 17:14), *Christ the Lord* (Luke 2:11), *God who was, who is and who is to come* (Revelations 1;8), *God who is but one* (1Corinthians 8:6), *Lord of hosts (army)* (Isaiah 6:5), *Lord of glory* (1Corinthians 2:8), *Lord both of the dead and living* (Romans 14:9), *Lord from Heaven* (1Corinthians 15:47), *God who is Alpha and Omega – the beginning and the end* (Revelations 22:13), *Amen* (Revelations 3:14), *King of kings* (Revelations 19:16), *Immutable One* (Hebrews 1:12), *He who searches the reins and the hearts* (Revelations 2:23), *He who is before all things* (Colossians 1:17), *He who knows all things* (John 16:30), *He who created all things* (Colossians 1:16), *Almighty* (Revelations 1:8), *He who takes vengeance* (2Thessalonians 1:8), *The everlasting father* (Isaiah 9:6), *King* (Jeremiah 23:5), *He who rewards* (Revelations 22:12), *He who has power on Earth to forgive sins* (Matthew 9:6), *He who resurrects the dead* (John 6-54), *He who is the same yesterday, and today and forever* (Hebrews 13:8), *The first and the last* (Revelations 22:13), *The Highest* (Luke 1:76), *Jehovah* (Isaiah 40:3, Jeremiah 23:6). Having seen your false and irrational arguments and references to never-occurred-miracles aimed to prove that such a Jesus is God, one can only

wonder as to why these arguments can't be used to prove any person as God? Even if you venture to spread such false stories for temporary gains, do you expect that all your listeners will lose their sense and believe you blindly?

From the above discussions it can be concluded that Jesus doesn't possess the characteristics of God.

Reward & Punishment

You (Christians) state that Jesus will come as Judge when the World comes to an end. Where do those who die before the hour of Judgement remain, in Heaven or Hell or some other place? If you say that these souls enter some other place, the statements in the Bible that men such as Adam, Abraham, etc. entered Heaven or Hell - well before the hour of Judgement - ought to be false.

If the souls enter Heaven or Hell soon after death and experience joy or sorrow, there is no need for judging the souls on the day of Judgement. If you say that it is obligatory to judge the souls, will those who are in Heaven sent to Hell and vice versa after the Judgement? Otherwise, the Judgement will become purposeless. Furthermore, if all those who are in Heaven and Hell at the time of Judgement will be allowed to remain in their respective places, should the souls be judged at all? Therefore, it is an utter falsehood that the souls would be judged on Judgement Day.

It is also said that Jesus will examine the deeds of each soul at the time of Judgement. He, who created some souls to undergo sufferings and some others to enjoy pleasures though they did

not, at the time of their creation, commit any meritorious or culpable deed, is partial indeed and is, therefore, unfit to be a Judge.

Based on which scripture will Jesus Judge the souls? If it is the Bible, could it be used for judgement since it got split into countless versions and it repeatedly contradicts itself as already seen? If the Bible still forms basis for Judgement (of Christians), what scripture will be used to judge people of various countries where the Bible is not at all known? If it is contended that these souls will be judged based on conscience which helps one distinguish good from bad, it can be done only on the basis of traditional scriptures from which one gains the knowledge of good and bad. A person's concept of good and bad conforms to the scriptures which he believes in. If a person's conscience is the yardstick of judgement, the judgement should be based on the scriptures of his own religion. If it is so, your claim 'all will be judged based on the Bible and that scriptures of all other religions are false' would turn out to be a lie. If they too would have to be judged on the basis of the Bible, it would be callous and unfair to punish them for not adhering to the tenets of the Bible which they neither heard nor saw in their lifetime. Jesus, therefore, doesn't have any universal scripture as basis for Judgement.

You state that Jesus would hurl into Hell all those souls who didn't believe in him. There would be many souls who would have died while in mother's womb or during birth or during their childhood or who were born blind or deaf or who would have led virtuous lives as dictated by the scriptures of their religion in countries where Christianity is not in vogue. All such souls would never have heard of Christ or believed in him.

Some persons following other religion would have continued to practice their own religion till death even after reading Bible as they might not have accepted it as word of God and they too wouldn't have believed in Christ. Would all such souls be sent to Hell or granted Salvation? If they are sent to Hell it would be a grave injustice. If they are granted Salvation, this will go against your proclaiming that those who don't believe in Christ would be sent to Hell.

How can it be justified that your God, who created the souls with impure senses, created impure religions, vices like lust, anger, etc., and laid down totally futile laws which none but God could abide by, can accuse these souls of being guilty at the time of judgement?

If it is contended that Jehovah did not create the souls impure, did the souls themselves acquire the vices? That the vices are seen in the souls from

the moment of their births is a proof enough that the vices were not acquired by the souls. If the souls acquired the vices due to the original sin, how did the primeval souls acquire the imperfect knowledge that led them to commit the original sin? It is evident that the souls were certainly created impure.

If it is argued that Jehovah, in the beginning of creation, did not ordain that things should happen in such and such manner, Jehovah's lack of such knowledge at that time could be the only reason for this. Had Jehovah possessed such knowledge, He would certainly have preordained. If events occurred not just as preordained by Jehovah, it would imply that Jehovah lacked omnipotence. You would, therefore, have to admit that things can happen in no manner other than as set by God's laws.

From the above discussions, even a child can see that it is a grave injustice that Jehovah, who created souls impure, created the tree of knowledge - issuing at the same time a commandment (not to eat the fruit of knowledge) - and created the Satan, should put the blame on others for the original sin which was an outcome of His own wrong deeds, should make a show of compassion, should pretend to take the sins of the souls upon himself and suffer for their sake, should

undergo the sufferings with his humanity²² only, should take credit as their saviour and should still appear as innocent on the Day of Judgement, should judge the souls and convict them guilty. So, it is totally unfair that Jehovah should convict anyone guilty.

Since you yourself say that it is a sin not to believe in Christ and also that he suffered for all the sins of all the souls born before and after him, the suffering undergone by Christ himself is in atonement for the sin of non-believing in him. If at all anyone has to suffer in Hell, it should be only Christ and it is, therefore, unfair to make the souls also suffer in Hell.

From the above discussion on 'reward and punishment' too, it is clear that Jesus doesn't possess the characteristics of God.

²² One central Christian doctrine (for most branches) is that Jesus Christ has two natures: humanity and divinity, Christ is at once both fully human and fully divine.

Story of Holy Spirit

You say that Holy Spirit assists God in deeds such as creation. If Jehovah was omnipotent, would he need the assistance of Holy Spirit for any of His deeds? If you explain that Jehovah is not himself incapable of any deed and “assistance of Holy Spirit” means that Holy Spirit consents to all the deeds of Jehovah, there is no scriptural testimony for this. Even if there is a scriptural support, it would only prove that Jehovah is not omnipotent since he needs the consent of Holy Spirit.

Why didn't the Holy Spirit create the Bible instead of inspiring the devotees to write it? Jesus should have been endowed with innate purity and knowledge when Holy Spirit created Jesus as flawless human being. If it was so, what was the necessity of the Spirit descending like a dove upon Jesus (John 1:32) and when Jesus, in the end, cried aloud in pain why did the Holy Spirit, having descended upon Jesus, failed to rescue him? Why did the Spirit, who sired Jesus from Mary, do nothing when Jesus appealed for His help crying 'My Father, My Father'?

Because Satan had assumed the form of a serpent when he came to lure the primeval man to

eat the forbidden fruit, Jehovah cursed all serpents declaring them to be the cause of original sin. But, though Holy Spirit had assumed the form of a dove while descending upon Jesus, He did not bless the doves that they won't be killed or eaten by anybody.

From the above, it is evident that Holy Spirit doesn't possess the characteristics of God.

Trinity

This word is not found in the Bible. While the Bible declares Jehovah, the Father to be God, it doesn't declare Jesus so. The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are mentioned together in just three sentences in the Bible.

For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one – 1John 5:7.

Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost – Matthew 28:19.

The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen – 2Corinthians 13:14.

Out of these three sentences the first one is found only in the Bibles compiled in Tamil and English languages but not in the Greek Bible, the original version. Many European Christians who were impartial and just found it to be an interpolation and have deleted this sentence from the Bible. So, we need not consider this sentence any further.

In the second sentence, is it said that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are one and the same or that every one of them is God or that all

the three are equal or that every one of these is venerable? No! Since it is not said that these three are either God or one or equal or venerable, how could you accept these three as Holy Trinity bearing the characteristics of God?

The third sentence too doesn't say that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are one and the same or that every one of them is God or that all the three are equal or that every one of these is venerable. Furthermore, Trinity is refuted by this sentence because it makes a mention of "God, son and Holy Spirit" and not "Father, son and Holy Spirit". This tantamount to that one of these is God while the other two are not. Since Christ is not God, he cannot be included in the Trinity (You may refer to the essay on Trinity, published on 28th October 1827 by Fr. Rev. Henry Lair for further details). Quoting the words of Father and Christ and also from the statements made by Bible scholars we shall now prove that Trinity is a myth.

Thou shalt have no other gods before me – Exodus 20:3. See now that I, even I, am he, and there is no god with me – Deuteronomy 32:39. I am the LORD, and there is none else, there is no God beside me – Isaiah 45:5. And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you. And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the

children of Israel, the LORD God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations. – Exodus 3:14-15.

In the following quotations, Jesus himself admits the above truth: *Have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? – Matthew 22:31-32.* When someone said that Jesus was good he countered, *Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments – Matthew 19:17.* *For there is one God; and there is none other but he – Mark 12:32.* *My Father is greater than I – John 14:28.*

*Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God – Acts 2:22.*²³

The following sentence shows that there is as much difference between Jesus and God as is there between man and Jesus. *But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God – 1Corinthians 11:3.*

²³ Here the author asks the reader to refer to English Bible. It seems this sentence was not found in the Bible translated into Indian languages in those days.

It would be too elaborate if I continue in this vein; I will just give below the names and numbers of chapters and sentences. Exodus 3:14,15 & 20:3; Deuteronomy 4:39, 6:4, 32:39 & 5:7; 2Samuel 7:22; Kings 19:19; Nehemiah 9:6; Psalms 83:18, 36:10; Isaiah 37:16, 37:27, 40:25, 41:4, 42:8, 44:68, 45:5-6, 45:21-22, 43:10-15; Hosea 13:4; Joel 2:27; Matthew 19:17, 7:21, 12:32-34, 20:23, 26:39, 5-42; John 17:3, 4:34, 5:38, 6:37, 20:17, 14:28; Corinthians 8:3; 1Timothy 1:17, 24:5, 6:15-16; James 2:19; Revelations 15:34; Colossians 1:3.

Based on the above quotations it can be concluded that there is no such thing as Trinity according to the Bible itself. So, you may better cease using the word Trinity henceforth.

Even assuming that 'Trinity' is contained in the Bible, let us examine whether it would stand the test of logic. The meaning of the word 'Trinity' is 'Oneness of the Three'. If three were to become one, will they or will not they still remain separately as three? If it is said that they remain as three even after becoming one, how is this possible? It is not at all logical. Could three pomegranate fruits remain as three and yet become one? Never! So, it is not reasonable to say that three would become one and yet remain as three. If 'three' cease to remain separate and become 'one', the 'three' will no more be there. Let us examine

which is the cause and which the effect among 'three' and 'one'. Since 'cause' is that which invariably precedes the 'effect', 'three' is the 'cause' in this case. 'Effect' is that which did not exist in the beginning and then came into being. The 'one' which didn't exist earlier is the 'effect'. When the cause gives rise to the effect, the cause perishes. This means that 'three' perish after becoming 'one'.

It can be concluded based on the above logic that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit would perish if & when they become 'one' (Trinity). If the 'three' perish to become 'one', would that 'one' at least exist forever? No! 'One' also will perish after certain time since an 'effect' cannot last forever. So, the cause, Father, Son & Holy Spirit and the effect, the 'one' will certainly come to an end.

There is another fallacy in saying that 'three' become 'one'. Three ought to undergo a change in order to become 'one'. So, Father, Son and Holy Spirit cannot become 'one' unless they undergo a change.

If 'one' was to become 'three', will it or will it not still remain as 'one'? If it is said that it remains as 'one' even after becoming 'three', it is not at all logical. How can a pomegranate fruit remain as 'one' and yet become three fruits? Thus, the contention that 'one' remained as 'one' and yet

became 'three' stands refuted. Amidst 'one' and 'three', 'one' is the cause and 'three' the effect. The cause invariably perishes to become the effect. It follows that the one God perishes to become the 'three' – Father, Son and Holy Spirit. As we have seen earlier, an effect invariably perishes after some time. Therefore, the effects, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, will certainly come to an end.

If it is contended that though the three are independent entities, they could be said to be one since they are equally powerful, all men should be deemed to be one since they are equal with respect to some qualities. But, all men cannot be deemed to be one since they have some common qualities but differ in all other respects. If you say that the 'three' could be deemed to be one since the three are identical in every respect, it is not acceptable just as we cannot deem three silver coins to be one coin though they are completely identical. Besides, you cannot claim that the 'three' are equal with respect to their deeds, qualities, etc. The Father created the world, made man a sinner, ordered a person who worked on Sabbath day be stoned to death, attempted to kill secretly a person who refused to kill the elders, bid Moses to rob Egyptians, gave Ten Commandments, existed before the creation, sat on the left side of Jesus

while receiving the sacrifice and performed many such acts.

Jesus was guilty of blasphemy and sedition; was crucified to death and sat on the right of the Father in Heaven.

Holy Spirit entered Mary causing the birth of Jesus and descended like a dove onto the Earth. From this it is evident that the 'three' are not at all identical in their deeds and qualities.

The possibility of three objects becoming one or one object becoming three is true only in the case of finite objects. This is impossible in the case of an infinite and all pervading entity. Can water filled to the brim in a closed vessel, divide itself into two or three parts and then merge again into one? Space is required for an object to divide itself into parts. All pervading entity has no scope to divide itself. It is only inert objects, which are subject to change, that divide themselves or merge into one. It is not reasonable that an infinite entity will divide itself or that many such entities merge into one. Therefore, it is a fallacy to say that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are 'one' and that the 'one' is also the 'three'.

Now, we shall deal with this topic in a different way. We shall first examine whether it is possible for 'two' to become 'one' and yet remain 'two'. If it is found possible, we could conclude

that 'three' could become 'one' and yet remain 'three'.

If it is contended that Father has become Son just as milk becomes curd, and assume that your contention is free from the defect called 'Purnatvadosha'²⁴, your comparison is an instance of theory of transformation (Parinamavaada²⁵) according to which the cause perishes to become the effect. When milk becomes curd, milk perishes. As can be seen from this example, the Father has to perish to become the Son. In that case, it would be fallacious to say that Father was in Heaven while the Son was on the Earth since milk that has transformed itself into curd and the curd that was created from milk cannot exist separately in two different places. Therefore, the example of milk and curd is not suitable in the case of Father and Son who are said to exist in different places.

There is one more defect in the example of milk and curd. In this example milk perishes and becomes curd. Curd also will not remain unchanged but perish later to become some new object. That something will also perish to become

²⁴ If you conceive two entities that are infinite, it gives rise to a defect called purnatva dosha since both these entities will limit each other. This will make them both finite and thus contradict the initial contention that they are infinite.

²⁵ This theory states that a cause transforms itself to produce the effect.

something else. This process will go on endlessly. Based on the above logic we can conclude that the Father perished to become the Son; the Son also perished to become another person; that person also perished to become yet another. This process also would go on endlessly. Therefore, neither the Father nor the Son can exist now. Nor can we know in what form they exist now. Even if we know this, we cannot assume that they will be there in that form forever. Your contention that the Father himself became the Son (like milk becoming curd), therefore, leads to the conclusion that neither the Father nor the Son exists now.

If it is contended that it was only a part of the Father that became the Son just as a part of milk turns into curd and the rest remains as it was, if a part of the immutable God modifies, He will become unfit for attributes like immutability. Moreover, when part of the Father transformed into Son, the remaining parts will also transform later governed by the same law that caused the initial transformation. Milk, having turned into curd, does not again become milk. Similarly, the Father, having become the Son, would not again become the Father. To say that the Father exists now would, therefore, be a lie.

We shall now examine this topic from another standpoint. If it is contended that the

Father doesn't perish when he becomes the Son and that He exists in the Son just as clay does not perish when it becomes pot but exists as the pot and becomes clay again when the pot gets destroyed and that just as the clay and the pot are not different the Father and the son are not different, this argument is not acceptable. The pot and the clay have to be in one and the same place; they cannot exist separately in two different places. But, since the Bible says that the Father was in Heaven and the Son was on the Earth, they were certainly in different places and so the example of clay and pot cannot be applied in this case.

Clay becomes pot after undergoing modifications in its shape. You will have to say that the Father also underwent changes to become the Son. Clay, when it is modified to assume a certain form, is called a pot. In the same way Jesus is the name given to the Father when He gets modified. And there are more flaws in saying that the Father and the Son are non-different like clay and pot. Jesus wore the crown of thorns. Did the Father also wear one? Jesus died on a cross. Did the Father also die on a cross? Jesus cried aloud, "Father, Why did you forsake me?" Did the Father also cry similarly? If He did so, it would mean that the Father had a father and that father would in turn have had a father. This would lead to a logical

fallacy known as ‘anavastha dosha²⁶’ (infinite regress). Jesus was man as well as God; Was the Father also like him? Jesus was born to Mary; Was the Father also born to a woman? It is said in the Bible that the Son (Jesus) sits on the right side of the Father in Heaven. One who is seated on the right side is not on the left side and vice versa. Do the clay and the pot occupy different places like the Father and the Son? Just as a potter is instrumental in creating a pot out of clay, a person is required to create the Son out of God. Who is this person and who created him? In view of all these flaws the example of clay and pot does not fit in this case.

Now, we shall examine whether the example of ‘object and image²⁷’ satisfies this case. Just as Sun’s is reflected in water, Jesus is only a reflection of the Father. This example also is not without flaw. Here, the Sun stands for the Father and the reflection stands for the Jesus, the Son. Since the Sun is real and its reflection unreal, the Father ought to be real and Jesus unreal and illusory, being a reflection. If it is so, the stories of Jesus about his taking birth, dying on a cross,

²⁶ This is a logical fallacy in which there is an endless series of statements or of causes and effects resulting in absence of finality or conclusion.

²⁷ This is the Bimba-Pratibimba Vada of Advaita Vedanta (Vivarana School).

performing miracles, being in Heaven, coming back to judge men at the end of the world, etc would be totally unreal. If Jesus himself is unreal, how could his stories be true? If his stories are false, how could the Bible alone be true? There is one more flaw in this example of 'object and image'. This example fits only in the case of finite objects and not in the case of infinite entity. The sun is in the sky and water is on earth. Sun and water do not occupy the same place. This is why Sun reflects in water. If Sun were all pervading, there would be no space for water and no scope for reflection of Sun in water. Since you say that the Father is infinite and complete, it is totally illogical to say that Jesus is a reflection of the Father.

Let us now consider the examples of 'rope and snake²⁸' and 'mirage'.

In this case, the Father stands for rope and Jesus stands for snake. This example is also not without flaw. Just as snake seen in a rope and water in a mirage are merely illusory and only a figment of imagination and have no existence apart from rope and mirage, Jesus too ought to be unreal and illusory and should have no existence apart from the Father. Could an illusory snake or water

²⁸ This is a very popular example given for superimposition in Advaita Vedanta. When one looks at a piece of rope lying on the ground, due to semi-darkness one sees a snake in the place of rope.

take birth in the womb of a woman? Is it possible for them to behave like living being? Never! So, it has to be false if you say that Jesus lived and performed miracles. How can one say that Jesus, who is compared to a snake-in-a-rope and water-in-mirage, really lived? What is the need for a religion in the name of such a person? If at all you require such a religion, should the intelligent men follow this religion and should this religion be proclaimed true before scholars?

To prove the oneness of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, some Christian scholars quote another example – that the trinity of light, colour and heat of the sun are one because they are attributes of a single object. By a similar argument every object could be said to have various unities²⁹ such as unities of two, three, four, five, six or more attributes. Since the earth (soil) has various qualities like hardness, smell, taste, form, touch, sound, colour, inertness, etc we would have to assume that earth has unities of two, three, four, five, six, etc depending on the number of attributes considered at a time. This logic could be applied to any object. Apart from the three attributes mentioned by you, the sun has many other

²⁹ This term, in this context, stands for oneness of many entities or attributes.

attributes such as touch, inertness, distance, roundness, size, etc. If the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are attributes, who is it that possesses them? Is that possessor separate or non-separate from the attributes? It is a common experience that attributes are not separate from the possessor of the attributes. Will the attributes act on their own apart from the one who possesses them? Will an attribute be born out of a womb, assume a human body, experience joy and sorrow and breathe its last? Since this is impossible, it is illogical to say that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, who are said to have played similar roles, are mere attributes.

Some Christians state that the unity of the three is like that of the term 'hasta-kara-pani'. This term contains three names (*in Sanskrit*) of one limb i.e. hand. According to them, Father, Son and Holy Spirit are names of one entity, just as *hasta*, *kara* and *pani* are the names of a single object (hand). The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit cannot, therefore, exist in different places. Do *Hasta*, *kara* and *pani* exist in different places? No! So, this simile also does not fit in this case.

If it is contended that 'one' has become 'three' just as the same man exists as both the body and the soul, this example is does not work in this case. Soul and Body possess opposite attributes

such as sentience and insentience, form and formlessness, pervasiveness and non-pervasiveness, immortality and mortality, domination and submission, etc respectively. But in the case of Trinity all the 'three' possess many common attributes such as sovereignty, omnipresence, immortality, etc. The example of body and soul does not, therefore, fit in the case of Trinity. Just as you say that each of the three in Trinity is God, can you also call the body and the soul individually as man?

Moreover, since it is said that the Father abandoned the Son when the latter was suffering, it is evident that they are not one. Since the Holy Spirit had to descend from Heaven upon Jesus when he was baptised and since Jesus addressed his disciples that he could not send the Holy Spirit to them until Jesus ascended to Heaven, it is evident that Jesus and Holy Spirit are not one. To say that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are one does not, therefore, stand to any logic.

Since Jesus did not really ascend to Heaven to be with the Father (*as shown in the chapter on the life of Jesus*) it is certain that the Holy Spirit has not yet descended to the earth to bless the Christians and that all your beliefs could only lead you to disappointment. Moreover, we will also have to conclude that the Holy Spirit will never descend on

the Earth because Jesus who went to Hell (as shown in the chapter on the life of Jesus) would never be able to reach Heaven as it is said in the Bible that there is no liberation for those souls who are in Hell.

Based on the above discussions it has been established that Trinity doesn't possess the characteristics of God.

Part 2

Pashu Prakaranam

The Souls

Creation

Oh! Christian preachers,

You say that the man came to possess a soul after God breathed into his nostrils, the breath of life. If you consider the breath of life as the soul, the soul would be a composite of atoms and therefore inert and perishable. Since it is seen that the breath is not aware of anything during sleep, it is wrong to assume that breath of life is consciousness. If it is argued that God created a soul apart from the breath, this is not borne out by any scriptural testimony.

Assuming that the breath of life or some other entity as the soul, it would perhaps be acceptable to us if the soul was said to be existing from time immemorial (Anadi) and that God, later on, equipped it with a body. If the soul is said to be newly created by God later on, we shall now show that there are many reasons that go against this contention.

If the soul did not exist from time immemorial, there was no reason at all for God to create it at a later stage. If it is argued that there was an unknown reason for this and that this

reason had been in existence from time immemorial, it would amount to that Creation was also beginningless.

If this reason arose by itself or was caused by someone else at a later stage, it would mean that God is not the Creator of all. If it was God who gave rise to this reason, it would require another reason for Him to do so. This would repeat endlessly giving rise to Infinite Regress³⁰.

If the soul was created by God out of a material cause, the soul would perish later and merge into that material cause. If it was created out of void, it would perish later and merge into void. But, it is would not be reasonable that something was created out of nothing (void). The God, who made use of materials like dust, water, etc while creating plants, humans and fish, would not create the soul out of void.

If the soul was created in God's image i.e. endowed with purity, knowledge and bliss, there was no need to equip the soul with a body. If it is argued that the soul needed the body to enhance its knowledge and bliss, it would mean that when the soul was created it was not endowed with pure knowledge and that its knowledge, deeds and

³⁰ Infinite Regress is a logical fallacy in which there is an endless series of statements or of causes and effects resulting in absence of finality or conclusion. This is known as 'anavastha dosha' in Indian Philosophy.

splendour were limited. Since God caused these limitations, you have to agree that God was devoid of compassion. Had God equipped the souls with pure bodies, they wouldn't have had the defects such as hunger, thirst, etc. If so, God bidding man to eat vegetable and man eating a fruit ought to be a lie. Those who have pure knowledge would not need even pure bodies. It is said in the Bible that the souls in Heaven are endowed with pure knowledge and will remain so forever. Since it is also said that whatever is seen is not eternal (Corinthians 4:18) and since the bodies of souls in Heaven too are visible, they are also definitely mortal.

Since the primeval man (though free from sins) was subject to hunger, thirst, etc those in Heaven would also suffer from hunger, etc and this would render the Bible wrong.

Had the souls been endowed with purity and knowledge from the beginning, how were they deluded by ignorance and mistook the prohibited actions for prescribed ones and vice versa? If it is said that this delusion was caused by the Satan, it cannot be so, because even a thousand Satans cannot delude a man unless his soul is afflicted by ignorance.

If it is contended that the delusion was caused by their lack of omniscience, the souls in

Heaven could also be deluded since they also are not omniscient. Moreover, lack of omniscience can only cause one to remain ignorant of unknown things but it can never cause one to misinterpret things already known.

If you argue that the internal cause for delusion is the freewill bestowed upon the soul by God, it is borne out logic that freewill would never let one be influenced by something and cause delusion. It would rather make one unaffected by external influence and free from delusion. So, your contention would be a logical fallacy akin to “There is no fire on the hill since there is visible smoke on the hill” ³¹.

If it said that the delusion occurred without any specific reason, it would mean that the souls in Heaven also could likewise be deluded without any reason. Furthermore, since it is said in the Bible that a soul in Heaven became Satan due to delusion despite there was neither any internal cause nor a Satan as an external cause, even the souls in Heaven also could get deluded, become sinners and land in Hell. Therefore, it is certain that the Salvation promised by the Bible is not eternal and obtaining such a salvation is of no obvious use.

³¹ This is an example of “viruddha hetvaabhaasa” i.e. contradictory fallacious reasoning in which one proves the opposite of what is intended. Hetvaabhaasa is known as Pseudoprobans in Western Logic.

Since it is said in the Bible that souls were not without beginning (Anadi) but were later created by God at a certain point of time, we can assume that there were no souls prior to Creation and no good or evil deeds committed till then by the souls. If so, why did God create souls different in many ways such as being born with superior bodies, mediocre bodies or inferior bodies; born blind, deaf, lame or with no bodily defects; born rich, poor, learned, ignorant, civilised, uncivilised, masters, servants, good, evil; born in palaces, forests, hills, oceans, cold regions, hot regions; make some die while they were in the womb or in their infancy, youth or old age; make some be born in religions such as Shaivism, Vaishnavism, Buddhism, Judaism and Christianity?

If it is said there is no reason required for the above differences and that God created the souls according to His will, no cause is required for the joy or sorrow that the souls would experience after their death and God will make the souls experience joy or sorrow by just sending the souls to Heaven or Hell according to His will. On the contrary, if you argue that the souls would be rewarded or punished after death, depending on the merit of their actions, there ought to be adequate reason for the souls experiencing happiness or sorrow in this world.

If God is one who gives happiness or sorrow without adequate reason, it would mean that He is devoid of justice, compassion, purity, omniscience, etc and would be deemed as showing partiality.

Even a man endowed with limited knowledge always divides his property equally between his sons without any bias. If he deprives one and favours another, people would loathe him as a betrayer. Such being the case, is it possible that God, who is omnipresent, omnipotent and is merciful to all and who has no likes or dislikes towards anyone, would give happiness to some out of love and sorrow to some out of hatred?

Furthermore, if a young boy, who is blind or deaf, lame or hunchback addresses God and cries, "Oh! My saviour! My God! You created my elder brother handsome, healthy and virtuous and me ugly, sick and wicked. What good service did my brother render you? Did I do any disservice to you?", would God reply to him, "I acted according to My will; Who are you to question me?" Would God tell him that He created the souls unequal so that He could run the world properly? Or would He say that the inequality was due to the sin they inherited from Adam? Or would He say that this inequality in His Creation was caused by some lack of care just as when a potter makes pots, some pots develop flaws in them? Or wouldn't God hear his

wailing at all? Or would He keep quiet even after hearing this? What would He do? Any of the above responses would be inappropriate. However, there ought to be a reason for God to create the souls unequal. The reason could only be the fruits of actions (*karma*) of the souls, accumulated from time immemorial (*anadi*). That would mean that the souls are also beginningless and were not created recently³². This proves that your contention, that the souls were created by God recently, doesn't hold good at all.

Based on the above discussions the creation of souls as described in the Bible stands disproved.

³² According to *Vedanta* philosophy six entities are beginningless and eternal: *Brahman* (Absolute Reality), *Iswara* (God), *Jiva* (individual soul), *Avidya* (ignorance), the difference between the *Jiva* and *Iswara*, the relation between pure consciousness and *Avidya*.

Creatures

Oh! Christian preachers,

You say that except man, animals, etc do not have immortal souls. We do not know how this is justified. Before determining whether or not animals, etc have immortal souls, we shall dwell upon the nature of the soul.

Knowledge is a natural attribute of the soul. Knowledge is of five kinds. Through the five sense organs, i.e. ears, skin, eyes, tongue and nose the soul perceives sound, touch, form, taste and smell respectively. If any of these sense organs do not function, it wouldn't mean that the soul is devoid of knowledge. A deaf man could not be said to be ignorant merely because his ears are out of function. Even if all the five sense organs are not functioning, a person need not be ignorant. If a man's mind doesn't function, he will not be able to perceive through any of the sense organs. A body which is in the above condition is called a corpse and it is devoid of soul. It is very well known that knowledge exists where the soul exists and that knowledge does not exist where soul is absent. If you say that animals are devoid of the soul which

is knowledge, why is it that pregnancy, birth, death, breath, food, sleep, copulation, love, hatred, memory, forgetfulness, fear, happiness, sorrow, etc are found alike in animals and humans? Animals also perceive the sense objects through the five senses. For example, since a dog, when called by name by the master hiding somewhere, rushes to him, it is clear that animals also have faculty of hearing. Since, when given cooked rice mixed with sand, it separates and eats only cooked rice, it is clear that animals do have faculty of taste. Since, upon seeing its master, a dog jumps and plays with the master and licks his body, it can be said that animals also have the faculty of vision. Since a dog runs away when someone is about to thrash him and cries in pain when beaten, it is evident that animals also have the faculty of touch. Since a dog can find out by smelling if the food is edible, it is clear that animals have the faculty of smell. Therefore, it is certain that animals have faculty of all the five senses.

If it is now argued that animals just have ordinary knowledge and lack discriminative knowledge and it is this discriminative knowledge which we consider as soul, this argument doesn't seem to be justified. Both a pocket sized book with

only a few pages and costing quarter Paisa³³ and a large volume of 4000 pages costing Rs. 500/- are books only. One can't say that the bigger one is a book whereas the smaller one is not so. A big Elephant and a small rabbit are nonetheless animals.

If you argue that the disparity in knowledge is the proof of existence or absence of soul, you will have to say that a scholar has soul and an illiterate person has no soul. If you say that though a person is illiterate, he could be said to have a soul, if he possesses a little discriminative knowledge, it would mean that since a month old child doesn't have discriminative knowledge, it doesn't have a soul and so it is an animal. If, according to you, one attains discriminative knowledge only when the soul enters the body, at what age does the soul enter the body? If you state that the soul enters the body of a child in a certain year, season, month, day, hour, minute, second, etc, would it be true in the case of all children? Experience shows that it is wrong to say that all the children develop discriminative knowledge at the same age.

Furthermore, what will happen to those persons who lose their discriminative knowledge

³³ Coin of least denomination used in India. One Paisa is one hundredth of a Rupee.

due to insanity in their old age? Would their souls leave their bodies? And if they regain discriminative knowledge after medical treatment, would the souls return to their bodies? If someone becomes insane, is then cured and if this happens 10 times repeatedly, would the soul exit and enter his body 10 times as and when he loses and regains discriminative knowledge? That the soul may never return to his body, if he is not cured of insanity, is unbelievable. During deep sleep one doesn't possess ordinary as well as discriminative knowledge. Since you say that animals do not possess a soul though they have ordinary knowledge, how could a man be said to possess a soul during deep sleep when he has neither ordinary nor discriminative knowledge? Will God take away a person's soul when he faints or when he is put under anaesthetic and bring back the soul on his regaining consciousness?

We shall now point out the observations made on this subject by European research scholars. "There is no basic difference between the knowledge of man and that of animal. Reasoning faculty of animals is not much different from that of man. Human body is animal body more evolved; human soul more evolved animal soul" - Burmeister.

“Recent experiments have shown that contrary to general belief, animals do possess inner faculties viz. mind, intellect and memory” - Czolde. “It has been found that animals are able to think, remember, love or hate. Their sense perception is even subtler than human perception” - Systeme de le Nature. “There are men, who resemble monkeys, in the forests of Borneo, Sumatra and Polynesia. They do not seem much different from monkeys in appearance and knowledge. They live without any memories of the past and without worry about past, present or future. They are troubled only by hunger. Their mental activity doesn’t differ from that of monkeys” - Dr. Hope. All the scholars, who have studied and thought about the origin of things, are of the opinion that the minds of animals and minds of human beings do not differ in quality but only in manifestation. As compared to animals man doesn’t possess any superior inner sense (antah karana³⁴). In order to place himself in an exalted status, man has declared animals to be capable of ordinary knowledge only.

Dr. Louis Buchner observes that in a zoo in Antwerp, an ape was found to prepare a bed inside

³⁴ Antah karana or the internal organ comprises of the intellect, the mind, the ego and the consciousness (*buddhi, manas, ahankara and citta*) according to Advaita Vedanta Philosophy.

its cage and sleep in it at night covering himself with a blanket like human beings.

The following is a true story narrated by Buffon³⁵. One day a surgeon in the city of Litous³⁶ saw a limping spaniel, took it home, bandaged it, kept it under observation for two days and released it on the third day. Until the spaniel was completely healed, it visited the surgeon every morning. After many weeks, the same spaniel brought another lame dog to the surgeon. Through its respectful and humble facial expressions, the spaniel implored to the surgeon to cure its companion just as it was cured. Can't you see that this was possible only because animals have memory and learn from their experiences? None can say that this is instance of ordinary knowledge.

Buffon himself has recorded about a fox that was more intelligent than men. When we read the observations of some European scholars about hippopotamus, birds and ants, we may think that these creatures are superior to men in intelligence. Much as I would like to quote a few of these instances, I shall refrain from doing so lest it would add more pages to this book.

³⁵ An eminent French naturalist of 18th century

³⁶ Litous is a city in Aquitaine, which is a region of France. But it was not possible to ascertain that this was the city meant by the author – Tr.

There is scriptural testimony to show that animals have knowledge. *Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made* – Genesis 3:1. *The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib: but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider* – Isaiah 1:3. *The dumb ass speaking with man's voice forbad the madness of the prophet* – 2Peter 2:16. *Go to the ant, thou sluggard; consider her ways, and be wise* – Proverbs 6:6.

Now, if you contend that animals don't have souls since they don't know about the existence of God, you would also have to say that atheists are devoid of souls. Since the soul knows any object only with the help of a valid instrument (sense organ), soul would need a valid instrument to know about the existence of God. Animals also would know about the existence of God, if they also had the valid instrument akin to human beings. Human beings too would not be able to know of the existence of God if they did not possess such an instrument. If you say that animals don't have souls just because they don't possess a valid instrument to know God's existence, it would mean that those who are born blind, deaf, etc and those who do not have spiritual masters or scriptures too are devoid of souls. Therefore, your contention, that animals have no souls since they can't know of God's existence, stands disproved.

If it is said that animals don't have souls because they do not speak, it would mean that dumb humans also don't have souls. Besides, how can one say that animals do not speak? It is seen that when, seeing a hawk hovering around in the sky, a mother hen clucks all her chicks recognise the signal, scurry along to her and hide under her wings. Similarly, when a wild fowl crows challenging another for a fight, the other fowl immediately rushes to meet the challenge; noticing danger, when a bird or animal makes a call all its kind recognise the signal and gather around immediately; when a bird or animal finds food, it calls all of its kind by making some sounds and they come quickly and eat the food. Moreover, don't birds like parakeets, mynahs speak our languages? Therefore, it is obvious that all animals and birds have their own sign-languages.

You state that animals, birds, etc were created as food for man. This cannot be accepted since man doesn't eat creatures like dog, leopard, tiger, crow, house fly, lice, bugs, etc and cannot eat micro organisms like amoeba. If you say that these creatures are useful to man though man doesn't eat them, creatures such as lion, leopard, bear, snake, scorpion, etc are of no use to man. On the contrary these are harmful to man since they frighten and

even kill him. So, your above contention cannot be accepted.

If you explain that after man sinned, Jehovah cursed him that the animals, etc would not, thenceforth, be dominated by him, Jehovah's curse is falsified the fact that man has domesticated many animals such as goat, cow, buffalo, pig, fowl, cat, etc. If it is contended that Jehovah cursed that man can dominate animals like cow, etc and not wild animals like tiger, etc, this stand is untenable since it is seen that wild creatures like tiger, snake are sometimes tamed by some men whereas some men get killed by tamed animals like cows, etc.

'Do not kill' is one of the Ten Commandments, the holiest of imperatives in the Bible. Aren't you violating even this commandment? If you say that this commandment was meant to forbid only the killing of fellow human beings, your interpretation is wrong since this commandment doesn't specify whether it is intended for man or animal. Besides, there is no scriptural testimony for your interpretation.

You say that following scriptural testimony validates your interpretation. *And saw heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending upon him, as it had been a great sheet knit at the four corners, and let down to the earth; Wherein were all manner of four-footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping*

things, and fowls of the air. And there came a voice to him, Rise, Peter; kill, and eat. But Peter said, not so, Lord; for I have never eaten anything that is common or unclean. And the voice spake unto him again the second time, what God hath cleansed, that call not thou common. This was done thrice: and the vessel was received up again into heaven – Acts 10:11-16. If your interpretation is to be taken as correct on account of the above command of Jehovah, there are plenty of quotes in the Bible to misinterpret the rest of the commandments too.

It is said that Jehovah sent a person to utter a lie which caused the death of Ahab and his army (1Kings 22). *Jehovah killed all the first-born lives in Egypt - Exodus 12, With the intention of enhancing His own glory, Jehovah made Pharaoh hard heartened, made him disobey Jehovah and killed Pharaoh and his army by drowning them in the sea - Exodus 14. Jehovah killed two sons of Aaron when they appeared in His presence-Leviticus 16:1, the LORD smote Nabal, that he died -Samuel 1:25-38.* Further He caused riots amidst Israelites and other tribes and decimated several lives. These instances from the Bible go against your interpretation that the sixth commandment forbids the killing of human beings only. On the contrary, they indicate that this commandment stood for killing of human beings too.

Jehovah instigated Israelites to flee with jewels borrowed from their neighbours – Exodus 11. Based on the above and similar Biblical instances, it could be interpreted that the commandment that bids man ‘not to covet the wealth of others’ ought to be suffixed with the words, ‘when you don’t need’.

Jehovah blessed the midwives Shiprah and Puah even though spoke lie – Exodus 1. Jehovah sent a person to utter a lie which caused the death of Ahab and his army, it becomes evident that Jehovah is dishonest (1Kings 22). These Biblical testimonies make one conclude that the words, ‘when you don’t need’ ought to be suffixed to the commandment prohibiting man from telling lies.

When David forcefully married the widow of Uriah, Jehovah commanded David’s wives to sleep with the neighbour – 2Samuel 12. The LORD said to Hosea, Go, take unto thee a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredoms: for the land hath committed great whoredom, departing from the LORD – Hosea 1:2. These Biblical testimonies make one conclude that the words, ‘when you are impotent or when you are not inclined’ ought to be suffixed to the commandment prohibiting man from committing adultery.

Since Jesus spoke rudely to his mother before a crowd when she came to meet him, the words,

‘when you feel like’ ought to be suffixed to the commandment bidding man to respect his parents.

It can, therefore, be concluded that the Ten Commandments are not obligatory and man is at liberty to violate them as per his whims and fancies. If man has the liberty to act as he pleases, he doesn’t need commandments or laws or a religion. The commandments and the Bible that contains them are, therefore, superfluous and Jehovah who ordained them ought to be ignorant.

If it is argued that animals, birds, etc were created as food for man since he eats them, it could be that man was created as food for lion, leopard, tiger, etc since they too eat human beings. Therefore, the animals were certainly not created as food for human beings. Even after realising this truth you continue to believe that the animals, birds, etc were created as food for human beings and that they have no immortal souls and persist committing this heinous sin owing to your faith in the Bible, fabricated by some unintelligent persons. Even if the Bible ordains so, is there any justice in killing the animals, birds, etc by hitting, cutting, drowning in water or by binding and burning them in fire and turning a blind eye to their sufferings showing towards them no trace of sympathy? It is said in the Bible: *And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein*

is the breath of life – Genesis 7:15. The same breath of life was blown into man as well as animals. How could you then say that human beings have souls whereas the animals do not? You seem never to recognize Biblical statements that are flawless. Alas! This must indeed be due to the force of evil.

When will you be free of the sins accrued from such evil deeds? From the above it can be known that animals were not created as food for man but took that form owing to the deeds in their past lives.

Based on the above discussions, the creation of animals, birds, etc as described in the Bible stands disproved.

Part 3

Pasa Prakaranam

Bondage

Original Sin

Oh! Christian preachers,

It is a basic tenet of your religion that sin committed by primeval man is passed down to all his progeny through blood and semen. What do you mean by 'sin'? Is it an object or a quality? Neither. Isn't the sin performance of forbidden action and non-performance of prescribed action? How could it be passed on to the progeny through blood and semen? Even if it is passed on, it is only the body that is formed out of the seeds of one's parents and not the soul. Since the body is inert and the soul is conscious they are of different nature. The soul, being different from the body, is not at all affected by the sin committed by primeval man.

If you contend that the soul of the progeny is a part of his parents' souls and that the sins of the parents could be passed on to the progeny, it would mean that the soul is divisible and therefore, the souls of a parent and his offspring are not at all connected. If so, is it reasonable to say that the sin of one soul would get stuck to the other soul?

Further, if the sin of a parent is transferred through semen to his son, why do we find that parents who are blind, deaf, etc beget children free from such defects; sick parents beget healthy sons; righteous parents beget wicked sons and wicked parents beget righteous sons? It is obvious from the above that sin is not at passed on through semen. Even if the sin gets so passed on, will that sin disappear by itself? Shouldn't God Himself put an end to it? If so, isn't it a great injustice on the part of God to burden the progeny with the sin of the forefathers?

Even the kings punish only the one who is found guilty; they never punish a person for someone else's crime. It is, therefore, unreasonable to say that God, who is omniscient, all-compassionate, perfect and impartial, will punish one soul for the sins committed by another.

From the above analysis of Original Sin, it is proved that it doesn't have any of the characteristics of bondage.

Part 4

Gati Prakaranam

Destiny of souls after death

Means to Liberation

Oh! Christian preachers,

You say that though God duly cursed the man for committing the sin, violating His command, He subsequently felt pity for men and sent His son into this world as 'sin offering' for their redemption. We have already shown that it was injustice on the part of God to curse man³⁷.

Why didn't God, who sent His son into this world feeling pity on men who were incapable of atoning for their sin, foresee that men would become sinners due to His curse and obviate cursing man? Otherwise, foreseeing that creation would cause sorrow and trouble to man and other creatures couldn't He have kept to Himself instead of proceeding to create the world? Even if He could not foresee, should He not, out of pity, have refrained from cursing man, knowing that man would not be able to bear His curse.

It would be acceptable if you admit that Jehovah bid man not to eat the fruit of knowledge, inflicted great misery upon him and his progeny and sent His son for their redemption so that they

³⁷ See Chapter on Initial creation.

would appreciate His Justice and Compassion and praise Him. Because all acts of Jehovah are in His own interest and not for the benefit of anyone else. Therefore, Jehovah is certainly bereft of eternal joy, justice and compassion.

You say that Jehovah sent His son into this world. From this, it is obvious that the Father, who sent the son, existed before the son and also that the son, sent by the Father into this world, is only a servant of the Father. Therefore, your claim that the Father and the son are same and equal is untenable.

We have established in earlier section³⁸ that Immaculate Conception of Christ in the womb of Mary, his divinity, his miracles and resurrection are all utter lies and also that Christ was just a human being and not God.

It is also said that Christ underwent the punishment in atonement for the sins of all men. Is it just to punish a person for the sins of others? Should not the persons be punished only for the crimes committed by them? Would the hunger of a person be appeased by someone else taking food for him? Would a person's illness be cured by someone else taking medicines for him? *The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the*

³⁸ See the chapter named "Life of Christ".

iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him – Ezekiel 18:20. The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin – Deuteronomy 24:16. In view of the above, that Christ underwent the punishment which in fact the men should have suffered is not at all reasonable.

Christ underwent suffering; so, he was not eternally blissful. If you say that it was only Christ's humanity that suffered and not his divinity and that his divine bliss was untouched by the suffering, it is certain that Christ's humanity undergoing the suffering could not have redeemed human beings from their sins because you yourselves say that the original sin cannot be annulled by human beings.

Is it not a lie then to say that 'Christ took upon himself the sufferings of men and saved them' and then explain that 'it was Christ's humanity that underwent suffering and his divinity that saved'?

Is it logical to say that Christ took upon himself and endured within a short period, the suffering that billions of souls were to undergo for

eternity? Using his omnipotence, couldn't he have simply absolved them of these sufferings?

You believe that God gives joy or sorrow to souls only as per His sweet will and not due to any other reason and that the souls, after death, will suffer eternally in the Hell for the sins they committed in this life. If so, all the sufferings that Christ endured during his Earthly life were as per the sweet will of God and this brought no salvation for man. If it is true that Christ took upon himself the sins of all men, he is destined to suffer eternally in Hell.

You believe that a soul would have to suffer eternally in Hell even for trivial sins. If so, Christ, who took upon himself countless sins of men, ought to undergo immense suffering in this world as well as in the Hell eternally.

If Jehovah, out of parental affection, would release Christ from this torment, it could be taken that He was partial.

You further say that Christ suffered to atone for the sins committed by all men till his time and for those sins that would be committed by men in future as well. If it is said that a person took food in advance in order to appease the hunger that another person would be experiencing in the subsequent year, would even a small child ever believe this?

So, there is no logic in saying that Christ was punished for the sins of men.

Don't you say that Christ had redeemed all men from sin? If so, Can sin exist afterwards in the world? That one man took upon himself the sins of all human beings and delivered them all from the clutches of sin is credible only to people like you, who believe that the sin committed by a single soul by violating God's command affected all human beings.

If Christ did really redeem all the souls from sins, all the souls should have instantly attained salvation. Since no such thing happened it is certain that Christ has not redeemed the souls from sin.

If a king, instead of punishing the men for violating his commands, lets them off without any punishment or takes measures to save them from the punishment or makes his own son undergo the punishment for their crime, would it be a sign of wisdom, justice, intelligence and glory on his part?

That Christ delivered all human beings from sin and saved them from having to undergo the punishment for their sins is, therefore, not at all true.

You further say that faith in Christ is the means for salvation and also that the children who died before or after baptism would attain salvation.

Do these children have faith? If not, what else is the means for their salvation? If you say that though these children do not possess faith they will attain salvation by Divine Grace, why is not this Grace bestowed also on the souls of adults who had no faith in Christ?

From the above analysis, it is established that the means of salvation as described in the Bible doesn't have any of the characteristics of true means of liberation.

Hell

Oh! Christian preachers,

Your belief that God will throw the sinners into the Hell and subject all of them to suffer forever in equal measure is untenable. How can you say that God will mete out the same punishment to a person who is guilty of all sins such as blasphemy, murdering, stealing, drinking liquor, committing adultery, telling lies, abusing the teacher and to another person who is guilty of only one of these sins?

Moreover, though the sins of having sexual intercourse with a prostitute, a virgin, another's wife, teacher's wife, mother or sister fall under the same category, each of these sins is graver than the preceding one and therefore it is unfair to give same punishment in all these cases.

How can you say that those who commit a sin of the same category for varying durations of one minute, 24 minutes (one ghati), 48 minutes (one muhoorta), three hours, one day, one week, six months (one ayana), one year, etc are equally guilty and that all of them would be given same punishment? Since the Bible says that *he that*

delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin (John 19:11)
it is evident that sins can be of different degrees.

It is not fair to punish all the sinners to suffer equally and endlessly instead of giving them punishments appropriate to the gravity and duration of each sin. If a person commits a crime, the king or the judge of that country examines carefully the category, gravity and duration of the crime and gives a fitting punishment to the convict. When an ordinary mortal with limited knowledge acts so, would the omniscient God mete out the same punishment to all the sinners and subject them to eternal suffering instead of giving punishment appropriate to the gravity and duration of the sin?

If a child errs, with the intention of bringing him back to the right path his father may bind him to a post and cane him or give him some other punishment. The child's father would never torture the child all his life. A man of compassion would act like this. While even an ordinary man is capable of this much compassion, how much compassion ought the God to show? Would God then, without even a grain of compassion, eternally torment the souls who are His children?

If some souls while in Hell, incessantly pray to Christ with immense faith to save them, will or will not Christ save them? If he will save them,

suffering in Hell will not be eternal. If he will not save them, it will mean that he doesn't have compassion for all and your belief 'Faith will bring Salvation' will become a lie.

Moreover, if a man has to suffer eternally in Hell on account of his sins, he would never receive the fruits of his good deeds. If it is said that a man has to suffer in Hell for his evil deeds, shouldn't it also be said that he has experience pleasure for his good actions? Is it fair to say that that he will never experience pleasure as the fruit of his good deeds? If this is held to be justifiable, it is only reasonable he will not have to suffer in the Hell for his sins?

If it is contended that it is the duty of human beings to do good; there is no reward in the form of happiness for doing good and that since sin is opposed to God it is only fair that sinner suffers in eternal Hell, it becomes obvious that good deeds don't bear any fruit and none will attain salvation by performing any kind of good deeds.

If so, one need not do anything good by thoughts, speech or action³⁹. Without doing any good deeds at all, one can attain Salvation just by repenting for one's sins, believing in Christ, getting baptised, receiving Eucharist, kneeling and

³⁹ In Indian philosophy, mind, speech and body are the three instruments of action (*trikaranas*).

praying to Christ with closed eyes and palms turned upwards and spreading his message.

If you say that it is necessary to do good deeds, they should also be deemed as means to Salvation. If so, good deeds are not without use. *But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind: And thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee: for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just* – Luke 14:13-14. *But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth. That thine alms may be in secret: and thy Father which seeth in secret himself shall reward thee openly* – Matthew 6:3-4. Why do you argue in vain that it is merely one's duty to do good deeds while as per the above quotes from Bible good deeds will bear fruit?

You have said earlier that sin is opposed to God. But sin causes suffering only to the sinner and therefore sin has adverse effect only the sinner. Since God is not at all affected by the sin of man, it is not at all proper to say that sin is opposed to God. That a man, who has done good as well as bad deeds, will experience the fruit of sin only but not of good deed is devoid of justice. It is only proper that he should experience the fruit of good as well as bad deeds. It is stupid to say that a person who performs several good deeds and only one sin will suffer eternally in Hell.

Hell, as described in the Bible, cannot be eternal and is bound to perish in due course because of the following reasons. It is of recent origin (it is not without a beginning); it exists in a finite space; it contains perishables such as brimstone, fire, vermin (insects), etc; the souls in the Hell have bodies and it is said in the Bible that whatever is seen is perishable. That the sinners would suffer eternally in Hell is, therefore, not possible.

From the above discussions, the Hell, as described in the Bible, stands negated.

Salvation

Oh! Christian preachers,

You say that believers in Christ will stay in Heaven for ever, enjoying supreme bliss. Just as those in Hell must undergo suffering in proportion to their sins, it is only fair that those in Heaven also experience happiness in proportion to their good deeds. It is not acceptable that every soul in Heaven will equally experience eternal joy.

Moreover, you say that the souls in Heaven too have bodies. Real happiness is to exist in one's own nature (soul). Identifying with a body, which is different from soul, will certainly result in sorrow and not in happiness. Therefore, liberation which is eternal and supreme joy is attained only when one becomes free from the identification with the body and gets established as the self-effulgent consciousness that is Self⁴⁰. Your belief that the souls in Heaven will experience eternal and supreme happiness cannot be true since they have bodies which are sources of sorrow.

⁴⁰ This is the concept of liberation (Mukti) according to major schools of Indian philosophy.

Heaven, as described in the Bible, cannot be eternal and is bound to perish in due course because of the following reasons. It is of recent origin (it is not without a beginning); *it is said in the Bible that God's crystal-clear light fills heaven. It is a city made of pure gold, like clear glass. It has a great and high wall, the foundations of which are adorned with all kinds of precious stones. Each of the twelve gates of the city is made of pearl. The streets are literally paved with gold. There is a pure river of water of life proceeding from the throne of God and of the Lamb (Jesus). There is a tree of life which bears twelve fruits, yielding a fruit once a month (Revelation 21 & 22);* it is square shape with definite boundaries; the souls in the Heaven have bodies and it is said in the Bible that even the Heaven would perish.

Moreover, since the Bible says that some souls in Heaven became deluded without any internal cause and without any external cause such as Satan and turned into devils, all the souls in Heaven would certainly fall from their blessed state.

From on the above discussions it is established that Salvation, as described in the Bible, doesn't have any of the characteristics of true Liberation.

Massacres

Christian missionaries claim that Christianity is superior to all other religions merely because it is prevalent in the whole world and has the largest number of adherents. There are many Hindus who blindly believe them. Applying the same logic one should say that untruth and injustice are more wide-spread than truth and justice and that the untruth and injustice have more adherents and are therefore superior to truth and justice. So, it is not reasonable to evaluate the superiority of a religion based on the number of its adherents.

Now, let us examine whether or not Christianity spread all over the world by fair means.

In the year 300 CE, Constantine became the emperor of Rome with the help of people of Nicaea. In order to express his gratitude, he helped them to establish their Christian cult into a new religion. It is said that he converted twelve thousand men, countless women and children to Christianity by offering each person 12 gold coins and white clothes (Gibbon's Decline and Fall of Roman Empire Vol-2, page 472-3). He also imposed several new laws with a view to wipe out

other religions. It was common practice to kill anyone who offered sacrifice to pagan Gods and confiscate all their properties. Theodosius, the Roman Emperor from 380 to 395 AD, decreed that adherents of other religions should not hold meetings and that the buildings used for such meetings would be confiscated. It was also decreed that there would be no freedom at all for non-Christians (Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of Roman Empire* Vol-3, page 412).

In those days, if non-Christians refused to part with their properties, they were likely to lose their lives.

In 5th century AD, a learned woman named Hypatia (of Alexandria)⁴¹, who preached her religion to a Christian and attempted to convert him, was stripped naked and dragged through the streets to the Christian church where they killed her by tearing her body into pieces and burning her mutilated limbs in pursuance of Exodus 22:20. During the reign of Empress Theodora of Armenia, nearly hundred thousand people were murdered. In 10th century French king Charles offered his daughter in marriage and fiefdom to Rollo, a chieftain of Normandy on the condition that he

⁴¹ Hypatia of Alexandria (born between AD 350 and 370 – 415) was a Greek scholar from Alexandria in Egypt, considered the first notable woman in mathematics, who also taught philosophy and astronomy.

receives baptism. He became a Christian and forcibly converted all his countrymen into Christians though they hadn't even heard of Christianity. In 10th century CE, hearing that the king of Poland has converted to Christianity at the behest of his wife, Pope John III sent several priests to Poland to convert the Polish people. When no one was willing to embrace Christianity, many unfair laws were introduced. Unable to bear the persecution by their Christian king, all the people finally embraced Christianity.

In 10th century CE, the Russian king married a Christian woman from Greece, accepted Christianity himself and converted all his people to Christianity at her insistence. In the same century, German king Otto conquered Denmark and offered them peace on the condition that all the people of Denmark embrace Christianity. Finding no other way out, all the people of Denmark embraced Christianity. People of Norway were also converted to Christianity in the same way.

In 6th century CE, King Childeric of France forcibly converted the Jews of France to Christianity. In 5th century CE, a priest named Flavian who campaigned against deification of Christ in the Council of Bishops held at Ephesus, was killed and his supporters were beaten by opponents.

The council of Toulouse held in 1229 AD, it was resolved that every city would have a council of Inquisitors consisting of one priest and three laymen whose duty was to search out heathens, forcibly convert them to Christianity and to torture and kill all those who refused to accept Christianity. Pope Gregory IX was the Chief Inquisitor of this Tribunal. It is said in the handbook of the inquisitor of Seville (in Spain) that heathens who refused to become Christians were subjected to extremely cruel treatments - stripped naked, heads clean shaven and tied to torturing-machines with limbs stretched apart, body reduced to pulp under crushing machines. For detailed information on this, you may refer to "History of the Inquisition" by Dr. W. H. Rule. Non-believers were crushed under '*Chevolet*' (a torturing machine) and gagged and choked to death. Spanish inquisitors killed 31912 heathens by burning them alive at stake, cruelly punished 291450 people and eliminated countless families.

In 1492 AD, the Spanish king issued an edict of expulsion. All unbaptised Jews of whatever age, sex or condition, were ordered to leave the realm by the end of the following July. They were not allowed to take with them gold and silver and other valuable assets. They were, however, permitted to carry away their merchandise, vessels,

etc. While the Jews were so departing several priests, standing on either side of the road, announced that no one should offer any help to the Jews. The whole country was rent with loud wailings of the Jews. Thousands of people succumbed to starvation and thirst on their way.

The Spanish king Ferdinand issued a decree in February 1502 AD, against Turkish population of three million residing in Spain since long but unwilling to get baptised, that they should leave the country before April. He further made several unjust laws forbidding them from taking with them gold and silver and other valuable assets.

Until 6th century, people of England did not embrace Christianity. Besides, they bore contempt against Christians and whenever they came across Christians they made tart remarks about them. The wedding of King Ethelbert of Kent with the French princess Bertha who was a Christian ushered in a change in this scenario. Bertha brought with her some Christian priests, patronised them by building a Chapel for them and managed to get Ethelbert converted to Christianity. Subsequently, all his subjects were converted. Aethelfrith, the monarch of Northumbria, who was mightier than all other English kings of those days and his people were so opposed to Christianity that they killed several priests at Chester. King Edwin who

succeeded Aethelfrith in 617 AD was also opposed to Christianity. Still, after his marriage with the Christian princess of Kent, the people of Northumbria became Christians under her coercion. As soon as Protestant Church came into existence in England, six new laws were enacted in 1539 AD. Five hundred people who did not observe these laws were imprisoned; many were burnt to death. During the reign of Edward VI, John Poyer was burnt alive and many others were hanged. Roman Catholic Christians burned to death 277 Protestant Christians during the time of Queen Mary. Amongst them were 55 women and 4 children. Several Roman Catholics and Protestants were killed by Episcopal Mission during the time of Queen Elizabeth. Both Roman Catholics and Protestants tortured and put to death those refusing to accept their religion, by burning and hanging. Many others were imprisoned and their properties confiscated. Who knows how many such atrocities were committed!

In Ireland, Roman Catholic priests were banished by the Protestants. Those Roman Catholics, who did not adopt the customs of Protestant reformers, were fined, put into prison and were not allowed to travel beyond a radius of five miles. In 1694 AD, Roman Catholics were barred from sending their children to foreign

countries for studies and in 1709 AD, Roman Catholic children were not allowed to be taught by people of their faith. According to a law passed in 1703 AD, only those Catholics who became Protestants had a legitimate claim for inheritance of ancestral properties and those who remained Catholics had no right of inheritance; Protestants who became Catholics lost all their rights for inheriting ancestral properties. Catholics cannot make a profit of more than 33% from their agricultural produce. If any Protestant reported any violation of this stipulation, the land will be confiscated from the Catholic and made over to the reporting Protestant; Catholics should not own a horse worth more than 5 pounds and if a Protestant spots a horse of greater value, the owner had to sell the horse to the Protestant for 5 pounds.

In Scotland, a law was enacted in 1670 AD that no public meeting should be held without prior permission of the authorities⁴². In 1674 all the lawyers were expelled from the country⁴³. In 1678 the islanders of mountain regions were brought to plains and were permitted to freely loot and kill people and set fire to the properties. 8,000 armed

⁴² This law was anti-Catholic

⁴³ Scotland

islanders were sent to the northern part of Scotland. These islanders committed many atrocities such as plundering the properties, stripping and molesting the women, binding together two persons and hanging them by their toes upside down from a tree, throwing a little girl into a pond infested with frog and other creatures and torturing a woman by torching her fingers for a long time till she died. During his 18 year service of Torquemada⁴⁴, Inquisitor General of Spain, 10,220 non-believers were burnt at stake and 97,321 non-believers punished with perpetual imprisonment and their properties confiscated (History of the Inquisition by Dr. W. H. Rule, Vol-1, page 115). Torquemada and his collaborators burned six thousand volumes of Oriental literature at Salamanca, under an imputation that they inculcated Judaism. In 1481 CE in Andalusia council of inquisition appointed by Pope Sixtus IV burned at stake 2,000 heathens and imposed fine and perpetual imprisonment on 17,000 persons. In Hungary, Kiska Usaita massacred the Pictas tribe. In Germany, Martin Luther, founder of the Protestant faith, hanged Catholic religious leaders as if they were thieves. He exclaimed “when will I

⁴⁴ Tomas de Torquemada (1420-1498) was a Dominican monk who was appointed as Inquisitor General of Spain in 1481.

wash my hands in their blood again” (Spanish Inquisition La Maistre, 1838 edition, page 67). It is this tyrant whom Protestants idolise as ‘the great reformer’. Arch Bishop Ushari read out a charter signed by eleven other bishops that showing clemency towards Catholic religious leaders was a deadly sin. John Knox⁴⁵, a Protestant Christian leader, declared that people should necessarily put to death all Catholic leaders and royal women of Catholic faith. Members of British parliament opined that to adopt compulsive measures to spread glory of God was only a right thing. Scotland parliament ruled that it was obligatory for Protestants to kill idol-worshipping Catholics. For refusing to embrace Protestant faith, Cramner, a minister under King Henry VIII in 1550 AD, killed 5 persons and tortured a woman by winding oiled-cloth around her fingers and setting fire to it (Students’ History England, Hume, page 291). The Duke of Alva boasted of killing 18,000 people in just 5 to 6 years of tyrannical government of the Netherlands (1567 to 1573). In the city of Paris on 24th August 1572 AD, soldiers massacred 1400 Huguenots (French Calvinist Protestants) at the

⁴⁵ John Knox (c. 1510 – 1572) was a leader of the Protestant Reformation in England and is considered the founder of the Presbyterian denomination.

command of the Catholic King (Charles IX)⁴⁶. They tortured those, who still refused to convert to Christianity, by stripping them naked, putting them in the torturing machine hand-tied, choking them by pouring wine through wide-mouthed funnels inserted in their throats. Their bodies were pierced with pins from head to foot, sliced to pieces with pen-knife and burnt. Their noses were ripped away with red-hot pliers. Description of the injustice, atrocities and massacres committed by the Christians would rather be endless. I have narrated them here very briefly; still, one can understand quite well from the above the grounds on which Christianity spread to such an extent. Who would not join Christianity, if one is subjected such unbearable torture? All those who feared death would certainly join. No one has joined Christianity on becoming convinced, as a result of thorough study and comparison of Christianity with one's religion, that Christianity is a better religion. Muslims too committed countless atrocities in order to convert Hindus to Islam. Yet, the atrocities committed by Muslims pale to insignificance when compared to the atrocities committed by European Christians. With

⁴⁶ This is known as St. Bartholomew's Day massacre

advancement made in Geography, Physics, Logic, Mathematics, Medicine, etc in European and American, scholars have, after thorough study, arrived at a logical conclusion that Christianity is a fabrication made out of facts borrowed from other ancient religions. Having risen above the false pride over superiority of Christianity, the European and American governments made constitutions to ensure impartial treatment and equal justice to all. As civilisation grew thus, the scope for all the evil practices of the Christians to spread their faith dwindled; ultimately it disappeared like fog at Sunrise. Unable to practice their age-long injustice and violence as done hitherto, Christian missionaries have now resorted to converting people by luring them with money and material. Finding Hindus unwilling to believe in Christ and his religion, the missionaries make Hindus believe that Hindus are trapped in an inescapable predicament and feigning sympathy towards Hindus, preach them Christianity. Through their sweet talks the missionaries try to convince Hindus that they will be saved from the danger if they embraced Christianity as though all those who have embraced Christianity have been redeemed. In fact the missionaries don't really possess virtues like justice, sympathy, etc.

That the atrocities and injustice committed by the Christians, as dwelt earlier, are in fact totally opposed to the Bible which is said to stand for justice and civilisation go to disprove their assertion, made with least hesitation, that Christianity was the cause for establishment of justice and civilisation in Europe is anything but right. This is further borne out by the fact that they burned entire libraries that contained books on science, philosophy, etc and imprisoned and tortured all those scholars who were masters in these subjects.

Since, during the period the educational institutions were under the management of priests, the syllabus consisted of only Bible lessons, subjects like science, philosophy, etc being totally excluded, became obscure. Torquemada⁴⁷ imprisoned and killed 119 scholars who were involved in building at Salamanca a library of six thousand books on science & philosophy. In France laws were made that no one should study Chemistry and other sciences and that no one should, without permission of Arch Bishop, print books which contained anti-Christian ideas. In 1619 CE in Delusa, Christians pulled out the

⁴⁷ Tomas de Torquemada (1420-1498)

tongue of Panini⁴⁸, a Gnostic, and killed him. There are still many more instances that can be quoted. I end this here for want of time.

1. Through the forceful arguments given in this book it has been established that the Father, the son and the Holy Spirit do not at all possess any characteristics of God, the sin offering of Christ and faith in Christ are no means of Salvation, the concept of attainment of Heaven by believers or condemnation of sinners to eternal Hell bears no logic behind it and the Bible is not a valid authority.

2. What can we do if someone tries to refute my arguments by resorting to denigration and false logic? How can we convince such people who boast victory even after utter defeat and have only mercenary interests and no intellectual honesty? Devoid of this nonsense, if someone disproves the contents of this book through fair means and logic, I am ready to accept his views.

3. Readers of this book will come to understand what Christianity really is. It is my earnest wish that this book is found of great use to Malayali Hindus and for fulfilment of this wish I seek the blessings of Lord Siva, ancient seers, righteous men

⁴⁸ Identity of this scholar could not be verified. His name seems to be misspelled.

and those scholars who have devoted their lives to redeeming Hindus from the menace of Christian Evangelism.

4. Oh Hindus! Please go through this book from beginning to end with total concentration and think for yourself as to whether or not the Christian faith stands disproved by the arguments contained in this book.

If and when the missionaries, with a view of converting to Christianity, present to you their arguments in all their enthusiasm, be sure you make valid counter arguments, disprove their stand, worship supreme God, Lord Siva and become blessed with prosperity and liberation.

Part 5

Kristumata Saram

(Quintessence of Christianity)

God's attributes

God has no beginning or no end; He is eternal, all pervading, free, formless and changeless; He possesses truth, knowledge, lordship, justice, grace, benignity, greatness, wholeness. He is also the Trinity – Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Amongst these, 'Father' is also known as Jehovah, 'Son' as Christ and Jesus and 'Holy Ghost' as 'Holy Spirit'. (Psalms 90:2, Jeremiah 23:24, Mark 10:27, 1Timothy 6:15, Psalm 102:27, Revelation 1:8, Genesis 17:1, Exodus 15:12, Psalm 145:17, Exodus 34:6, Matt 28:19, Deuteronomy 32:4 & 33:27).

Creation, preservation, destruction, punishing and rewarding are the activities of God. God who has no beginning wished initially to make creation. He created angels in Heaven and sent into Hell those angels who disobeyed Him. (Jude 1:6, Revelation 12:9).

Then He created the Sky and the Earth, and light on the first day, space and clouds on the second day, the trees and plants out of the earth on the third day, brilliant stars on the fourth day, marine life in water on the fifth day and various kinds of animals on the sixth day. Thereafter, He willed to create man on the same day and created man in His own image and blew life into him through his

nostrils and placed a soul in him. Then he created a woman out of the limb of the man and blessed the couple and sent them to the Garden of Eden in Asia Minor. He bid them to raise families, multiply into various tribes, occupy the whole of Earth and have all other beings and objects under your dominion. He said to them, "You can all plants as your food. Protect trees and maintain this Garden of Eden. You may eat all types of fruits except the one from the tree of knowledge growing in the centre of the garden. If you eat the fruit of this tree you shall, as punishment, die the same day." To serve God, to observe Sabbath, to serve other beings, to do one's duty and to abstain from the forbidden fruit – these were only the principles of religion for the primeval man. While they were living in the above fashion, Satan, the chief devil appeared in the form of a serpent before the woman and told her that eating the forbidden fruit would not cause death and on the other hand it will make her eyes more luminous and bestow her power of discrimination. The woman found the fruit very attractive and on eating, she found it very delicious and her mind became clearer. She offered the fruit to the man who ate it. As soon as the fruit was eaten, their eyes turned more luminous and they became aware of their nakedness. Immediately they wove a cloth of fig

leaves and covered themselves. As the evening approached, hearing the footsteps of Jehovah, the man and the woman, not wanting to face Him, hid themselves behind trees. God said, "Man, where are you?" The reply came from behind the trees, "Due to my nakedness I am afraid to come before you". God then asked him, "Who made you aware of your nakedness? Did you eat the forbidden fruit?" "The woman with me gave me the fruit and I ate it". God then asked the woman, "Why did you do so?" She replied, "The serpent beguiled me into this". The God turned toward the serpent and uttered, "Because you did this, you will become most cursed amongst all lives, creep on your belly all your life and eat dust. Besides, yourself and this woman will turn bitter enemies and this will remain so for all generations to come. So, her offspring will step on your head and you will bite their heel". God spoke to the woman, "You will deliver children after great pain. You will subservient to the man and will be under his control". He then turned to man and spoke, "Because of you the Earth became cursed. It will henceforth grow thorny bushes and trees. Till the end of your life, you will sweat to obtain food. And finally you will turn into soil from which you came. (Genesis 2 & 3)

God further created souls in the form of progeny of the primeval man and woman. They became sinners due to the forbidden action by the primeval man and woman. The sin gave rise to sorrow. (Romans 5:12-19, Psalm 51:5)

God thus creates the souls, lets them be encased in physical bodies for a length of time as desired by Him and destroys them at the end of their lives. He punishes or blesses according they are inimical and impure or are faithful, submissive and pure. (Psalm 103:19, 2Peter 3:10, Matthew 25:46)

Attributes of the Soul

At the time of creation, Jehovah created souls of pure nature. These souls have a beginning and are eternal; free throughout their stay on Earth; have a mind which is an instrument of perception; they are conscious entities with qualities such as thought, knowledge, love, hatred, effort, joy and sorrow. Among these, pure souls comprise of angels who never committed sins since Creation and those who have become absolved of their sins. Impure souls are those who have accumulated sins either by themselves or by their forefathers. (Genesis 27, Job 33:4, Matthew 10:28, Luke 24:39, Job 35:10, Ecclesiastes 12:7)

Though the impure souls are free by nature, since they reap punishment (Hell) by their sinful actions and do not reap reward (Heaven) by any meritorious actions, they remain bound.

Nature of Bondage (*Paasam*)

Paasam is inert object; it has a beginning and an end, it is transient - but divine law may render it infinite and eternal; it is not pervading, not free and is perceivable to senses; it changes and is insentient. There are two kinds of *paasam* – one is *Karya paasam* (material bondage) and the other is *Dushkarmapaasam* (bondage of evil actions). *Paasam* of matter is created by God without any material cause. Elements like earth, water, fire and air are material *paasam*. It is further divided into pure and impure ones. Pure ones are regions (like Heaven) which retain their pristine glory. Impure ones are regions (like the Earth) which are tainted due to sinful actions of the souls. *Dushkarmapaasam* is the sinful action which accrues due to non-performance of prescribed duties and performance of forbidden activities. It is passed down to progeny through blood and semen and it manifests through tendencies. It leads to sorrow; it spoils the purity, causes delusion, suffering, disease, old age and death. It can be remedied by sacrifice

(atonement) and if left not remedied it results in eternal suffering in Hell. Sins are of two types – inherited sins and acquired sins. There are two opinions regarding definition of sin – one states that not believing in God's words is sin whereas the other states that violating God's command is sin. Subjects that have not been clearly dealt with in Bible have been interpreted differently by various commentators according to their view point.

Deeds of Soul

Souls born in physical bodies continue to commit sins further and further due to the evil tendencies rising out of inherited sin. Some souls, however, happen to do some meritorious deeds. Still, only those souls, who sever the bondage by gaining the knowledge of the Bible which reveals the will of God, attain salvation.

Destiny of Soul

Souls put in effort in this world and experience joy and sorrow as per God's will. Those souls who commit sins and those who do good deeds but do

not gain access to means for salvation will reach eternal hell and experience endless suffering.

4005 years after the creation, out of the Trinity of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, Son descended on Earth as Christ and entered the foetus created by Holy Ghost in the womb of Mary, the spouse of Joseph, in land of Canaan in Asia Minor. He was born with both divine and human nature, grew up in the company of learned people and was baptised at the age of 30 by John. Possessed by Holy Ghost, he fasted for 40 days in the forest. He was tested by Satan who deceived humans, but vanquished the Satan, worked miracles, adhered to the commands that were usually violated by men, appointed apostles to spread religion, formulated the codes for rituals like baptism, took upon himself the sins of all men, underwent all the sufferings which the men should have suffered for their sins. He was crucified on a cross and he died as a sacrifice for sins of all. On third day after his death, he came back life and ascended to Heaven and occupied a place on the right of the Jehovah.

The sacrifice made by Christ is the only means of salvation and implicit faith in Christ as redeemer is, therefore, the only way to attain salvation. While faith counts as the means to salvation, qualities like honesty, justice and compassion are

merely ethical values. Because these are part of one's duty, they cannot be taken as sacrifice.

Christ has laid down two rites to remind men of God's Grace. They are baptism and Eucharist. Baptism is ceremonial bath, in water purified in the name of Holy Trinity, symbolising the memory of Christ's Grace which causes transformation of mind and purification from sin. Some conduct this rite with slight variation. Eucharist is the consecrated bread and wine eaten and drunk during the ceremony of Communion in symbolic memory of flesh and blood of Christ who is the sin offering. Baptism is in lieu of circumcision and Eucharist is in lieu of communion festival. In this manner Pure Christian religion evolved from Judaism. With the advent of these rites were introduced, Christ's followers ceased to observe the age old rites of Judaism.

The means to Salvation

Having cursed humans as per divine justice, Jehovah found the souls turning into sinners due to His curse, wished to bless them out of compassion for them and decided to devise means to Salvation.

What are the means to Salvation

The means to Salvation is that which renders souls pure by nullifying their sins. Sacrificing is the action conducive to removal of sin. The offerings such as goats and cows, given in sacrifice to God by men to alleviate their sufferings, are the properties of God and all the good deeds that men do are in fulfilment of their duty to God. Neither are souls, therefore, independent agents for performing sacrifice nor goats, cows, etc independent offerings, nor are good deeds by souls meritorious by themselves. Hence, all the above will not bear fruit in the absence of law of divine grace. God Himself is the independent doer of sacrifice. It is Christ the God who agreed to become independent sin offering by His descent to Earth. The divine good deeds such as the offering of physical body by Christ and his death are alone the independent good deeds. Jehovah assigned His son to be born amongst men, to vanquish Satan, to preach ultimate truth (*paramartha*), to make a sin offering of himself and to bless the souls. Christ agreed to this and became the mediator. In order to indicate this it has been said that woman's progeny will sever the serpent's head. This is the law of divine grace. As a symbolic reminder of Christ's

sin offering, sacrificial offer of a lamb came into vogue.

Early Christianity comprised of the above concepts, beliefs and practices. 1657 years after Creation, at the end of the great deluge, Jehovah permitted meat eating and in 2106 He bid Abraham to perform circumcision. 2513 years after Creation, He appeared before Moses and he gave him 3 sets of laws in elaboration of the then extant laws. They are the laws of ethics, laws of religious conduct and laws of propriety.

1. Worship only one God.
2. Do not worship any other God.
3. Do not utter God's name in vain.
4. Observe Sabbath on Saturday. (these 4 pertain to God)
5. Respect your parents.
6. Do not commit murder.
7. Do not commit adultery.
8. Do not commit theft.
9. Do not give false testimony.
10. Do not covet other's wealth. (these 6 pertain to man)

These Ten Commandments are Laws of ethics.

Laws of religious conduct comprise of cleanliness of body, cleanliness of materials, fasting,

participating in the service at temples, worship, communion, etc.

Law of propriety are the moral codes and punishment pertaining to war, peace, mother, offspring, master, servant, food, clothing, house, land, grains, lordship, money, cattle, birds, animals, human body, life, etc.

Amongst these, the laws of religious conduct are means of achieving devotion and fulfilment of desires, mark of identity of devotees and symbolic reminder (jnapaka chinham) of Christ's sacrifice. These were the tenets of Judaism from which evolved early Christianity.

The deeds of Holy Ghost

Holy Ghost, one of the Trinity, helps in God in activities like Creation (Psalm 104-30). He inspired pure devotees to compose the Bible (Themotheus 3:16, Peter 1:12). He brought Christ into the world as a man without a blemish, equipped him with complete knowledge and Grace. He enlightens the hearts of devotees of Christ so that they can pray and comprehend Bible. He reveals Christ to them as the son of God, lifts them from sorrow, cleanses them of all sins, bestows them with devotion required to serve God completely and enriches

them with all required virtues. Prayer is chief means of communing with Holy Ghost.

All must know Christianity, become aware of their sins and repent for them, have faith in Christ as prescribed in Bible, join the church which is the community of Christ's followers, receive baptism and Eucharist, pray to God, earn God's Grace through firm faith, read and understand Bible, preach it to others and not swerve from the that state.

Reward & Punishment

As the world comes to an end, Christ will appear in all his glory in order to make judgement, will call before him all those who are alive at that time and also those who were dead after bringing them back to their physical bodies, makes the good ones assemble on his right side and the bad ones on his left, inquires after their evil and good deeds, punishes the evil ones who did not believe in him by consigning them to molten brimstone and raging fire) in eternal Hell and rewards the good ones who believed in him by sending them to eternal Heaven which is pure and is free sin, sorrow and death.

Salvation

Souls who attain Salvation will be free of sins, will enter Heaven which is region of purity, acquire pure bodies, praise the God and enhance His glory and experience the joy of presence of God for ever.

End of “Essence of Christianity”

Appendices

Life and work of Sri Chattampi Swamikal

Chattampi Swamikal was born in 1853 at Kollur village in Kannammoola, Tiruvananthapuram district in South India. Kunjan, as he was named by his parents, was the eldest son of Vasudeva Sharma, a temple priest and Nangamma Pillai. Kunjan's parents were not rich enough to send him to school. Kunjan was sharp witted and learned by himself from the school books of other children. When he was eleven years old, he used to stand outside and listen attentively to Sanskrit lessons taught by a teacher to Brahmin boys at Kollur Matham, house of a prominent Brahmin family. Once, when the teacher's question could not be answered by any of the Brahmin boys, Kunjan provided the answer from outside much to the surprise of the teacher. The teacher came out and spotted the boy and recognized his brilliance and enlisted him in his class. He was fortunate to learn Sanskrit, thus, for two years.

A venerable looking sannyasi, who happened to stay for some time in a nearby Sastha Temple, took notice of Kunjan's intense interest in spiritual matters and after testing his fitness and initiated

him in the spiritual path by blessing him with a mantra of Lord Balasubrahmanya. Kunjan many siddhis through practice of this mantra and came to known as Shanmukhadasan.

He, then, joined the elementary school run by Raman Pillai at Petta, a nearby village. Coming to know about Kunjan's spiritual qualities, Raman Pillai made him Chattampi, the monitor of his pupils. Kunjan was later better known as Chattampi. Once, Raman Pillai found Chattampi at a Shiva Temple. Chattampi was lost in Samadhi and was in close embrace with the Shiva Linga.

At the age of sixteen, after doing stints as a labourer during construction of Secretariat at Tiruvananthapuram and as a writer of land deeds, Chattampi landed on a nice job in the Secretariat through the grace of Sir C Madhava Rao, Diwan of Travancore State. During this period, Chattampi took great interest in painting, wrestling, music, astrology and medicine and mastered them.

Chattampi joined Jnana Prajagara Sabha founded by Thykattu Ayyavu Swami, a famous yogi and learned Vedanta and Hathayoga. He was greatly impressed by Subbhaya Jatapatikal who attended the annual Navaratri Sadas (a religious meet) at

Tiruvananthapuram and resigning his job in the Secretariat he proceeded to Kalladaikurichi with Jatapatikal and studied Vedanta, Yoga, Logic and Mantra Shastra under his tutelage for four years. He also made a deep study of Tamil literature. He, then, went on pilgrimage throughout India.

He initiated number of spiritual seekers in various systems of spiritual practice. Swamikal was also a social reformer and worked hard to free the society from blind beliefs and useless rituals. He has authored a number of books on Veda, Vedanta, Tantra, etc.

In 1892, when Swami Vivekananda had a meeting with Chattampi Swamikal in Ernakulum, they discussed about Chinmudra and Swami Vivekananda found Chattampi Swamikal's explanation on Chinmudra most satisfactory⁴⁹. Swami Vivekananda later remarked that Chattampi Swamikal was the greatest among those he met in Kerala.

Chattampi Swamikal passed away in the year 1924 at the age of 71.

⁴⁹ Life and Works of Chattampi Swamikal (Chattampi Swamikal: Jivitavum Kritikalum), Dr. K. Maheshwaran Nair, page 87, 2nd edition, 1995, published by Dooma Books, Trivandrum